

KYRIACOS HADJIOANNOU, Ἡ Ἀρχαία Κύπρος εἰς τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς Πηγὰς.

Τομ. Α΄. Τὰ Θρυλούμενα, Ἱστορία καὶ Ἐθνολογία ἀπὸ τῶν Προ-ἱστορικῶν Χρόνων μέχρι τοῦ 395 μ.Χ.

Ancient Cyprus in Greek Sources. Vol. I. **Legendary Traditions, History and Ethnology from Prehistoric Times to the Year A.D. 395.** Edition of Holy Archbishopric of Cyprus on the Year of Independence. Nicosia, 1971. Pp. xxvii, 481.

This is the first volume of one of the largest and most important works ever compiled about Cyprus. The prefatory note of the author summarizes the content and the form of the work as follows

"This is the first of a series of four volumes under the general title **Ancient Cyprus in Greek Sources.** The book will contain all references to Cyprus or Cypriotes from prehistoric times to 395 A.D., extracted from all authors who have written in Greek (Greeks or foreigners) including the books of the Greek Old and New Testaments. The title of each volume in English translation is as follows

Vol. I. (The present volume): **Legendary Traditions, History and Ethnology from Prehistoric Times to the Year A.D. 395.**

Vol. II. **Mythology and Religion, Geography and Geology.**

Vol. III. Part 1. **Sciences, Letters, Arts and Crafts.**

Vol. III. Part 2. **The Greek-Cypriote Dialect as it is Recorded by the Lexicographers and the Scholiasts (Commentators).**

Vol. IV. **A Commentary** by the author on the previous vols. I-III.

Each volume will contain the Greek text and a translation of it in Modern Greek, Demotiki. The passages are arranged and numbered in chronological order. The decimals denote that the passages refer to the same historical person or event."

The book is a painstaking, thorough and revealing collection of important historical material that throws strong and valuable light on ancient Cyprus. It fills a long-felt need for a handy and complete collection of all information from Greek sources concerning ancient Cyprus. Furthermore, it is brilliantly conceived and expertly executed. It achieves an excellence that sets new standards for scholarship on collecting and presenting material concerning the history of Cyprus -- or the history of any other country, for that matter. In order to collect and determine the value of this material, Dr. Hadjioannou spent many years searching the entire realm of Greek sources and studying them thoroughly. Now he presents the results of his research and provides a complete and systematic record of all pertinent information in a magnificent book which, when completed, will certainly prove to be an indispensable work of the greatest value to those studying the history of Cyprus. This is quite significant, because several modern historians have either thoroughly ignored basic information from ancient Greek sources or misinterpreted them according to their biases. But now that the evidence of all Greek sources is available in this book, the historian of Cyprus is expected not only to examine it as a matter of ordinary scholarly process but also to use it wisely, objectively, in reconstructing the life and history of ancient Cyprus

By coordinating the testimony gathered here with the abundant new archaeological evidence and with cross references to other authoritative sources, the historian may reach some conclusions radically different from those accepted hitherto without the benefit of this knowledge. What is more important, it is possible now not only for the specialist-scholar, but also for every reader to have easy access to this material both in its original form and in Modern Greek translation so that he may judge for himself the relevance and value of particular information and its best interpretation.

As already noted above, before Dr. Hadjioannou's collection, there was no book comprising all references on Cyprus from ancient Greek sources, not even a representative compendium of them. The *Excerpta Cypria* of C. D. Cobham and its *Supplements* by Th. Mogabgab, valuable as they are, differ in time covered, in form, and in scope from the present book. They provide only translations of excerpts from several languages into English or original English texts, which deal with Cyprus from ancient times until the early nineteenth century. These excerpts, however, are arranged rather haphazardly, not chronologically or according to their themes. In fact, they make the lack of a systematic and complete collection encompassing all available ancient Greek sources on Cyprus even more evident. To the extent that any book can rectify this lack, Dr. Hadjioannou's book makes a valiant, valuable, and successful effort to do so. From its shadowy, half-mythic beginning to the end of the fourth century of our era, the history of Cyprus is, fragmentarily of course, but vividly related in this collection of Greek sources.

We may give here only a brief account of the book. After a four page preface and the short prefatory note quoted above, there follow thirteen pages of abbreviated entries referring to the authors and works from which the Greek passages were taken. Then the main body of the book follows, some 440 pages, consisting of ancient Greek texts with their translation in Modern Greek juxtaposed. This vast material (680 entries) is classified into sixty-four chapters according to their general theme, subdivided into many sub-chapters (sometimes interrelated) dealing with legendary traditions, history and ethnology of Cyprus in chronological order from prehistoric times to A.D. 395. The source and especially the historical significance of each excerpt are only sketchily explained here, because the entire last volume of the series will consist of a complete commentary of the author on the previous volumes. However, even in this first volume, besides the accurate bibliographical reference there is at the head of each excerpt a condensed summary or a plain but characteristic title in both the ancient text and its modern Greek translation. These brief introductory remarks and notes will prove very helpful, particularly to the uninitiated reader. The book ends with three very detailed and useful indices: the first one (pp. 443-453) lists the passages according to their authors, the second (pp. 455-475) is an index of persons and things, and the last one (pp. 477-481) is the general index of the contents.

The book makes a remarkably vivid and compelling reading. For it is not only a dependable record of the basic facts of traditional ancient history of Cyprus, but also a marvelous introduction to many faces of private and public life of the ancient Cypriot people, especially as they appear in many formerly unheeded or little known anecdotes, tales and incidents. For the

collection often comprises the most unusual stories which nevertheless are evidence of an effervescent life and an active culture. From them we are able to gain considerable insight into how people then lived and thought and acted, sometimes outside the "official" aspect of history. Thus the historical events gain the freshness of life and a perspective based on actual fact. One may say that all the ingredients are here to make the reading of this book worthwhile. For it reminds us of aspects of ancient Cyprus which we may have forgotten and gives us many fascinating facts we wish we had always known. What emerges from this diverse material is a much truer picture of ancient Cyprus life in times of peace as well as in times of turmoil. Also, the combination of important historical events with small incidents from everyday life makes the book both thought-provoking and pleasant. In short, it greatly enhances our understanding and appreciation of ancient Cyprus. Dr. Hadjioannou writes in his Preface.

"My effort was not only to give something useful for the archaeologist, the historian, the philologist and the man-of-letters, but also something understandable to the wider public, something that may please with the charm the demotic language possesses and may attract the reader. Besides, the history of Cyprus is full of lively episodes and anecdotes that are rarely reported by contemporary historians. Yet those episodes and anecdotes give more color to life and present a more graphic picture of conditions and mentality during a certain period than the boring narration and dry description of events."

Ancient Cyprus in Greek Sources is a substantial contribution to Cypriot studies and may prove to be an enduring one as well. It is a solid work of thorough research, a remarkable display of creative scholarship. It provides an absorbing, although fragmentary, chronicle of ancient Cyprus in a most competent and authoritative way. It is a work that will serve as a comprehensive survey for the average reader but also as a documentary introduction for special investigators of the topic. With its treasure of factual and interesting information, it will provide accurate perspectives and may well serve as the handbook for any erudite and judicious study of the world of ancient Cyprus.

In scope, the work is an amazing feat considering the amount of succinct and precise information it supplies. It measures up to the most stringent standards of scholarly research, as even close scrutiny will reveal. This book must be regarded as the equal of the similar great works of history for other countries.

We may add that the translation of the ancient Greek texts in Modern Greek "Demotiki" is pleasantly readable, even though it does not have grammatical uniformity and consistency. In fact, Dr. Hadjioannou does not believe in such uniformity, and clearly declares so in a disarming (for us) introductory remark. (Therefore, there is no point in discussing this problem here.) Several oversights in the translation and some other similar inadvertent errors in the translated texts do not mar the outstanding value of the book. The same may be said about the misprints which are, surprisingly, frequent, although one might expect them in such a large and typographically complicated edition. The truth is that the book is handsome in construction, with large readable type and good heavy paper. It is indeed a credit to the

Zavallis Printing House who did the printing. Due credit must also be given to the Archbishopric of Cyprus and Archbishop Makarios for providing the funds for this great edition which, incidentally, was made on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Greek Revolution of 1821: Without their assistance this book would have never seen the light of publication.

In sum we may say that the first volume of **Ancient Cyprus in Greek Sources** is a great achievement. From the high quality of this volume it is possible to greet Dr. Hadjoannou's enterprise with the greatest respect and enthusiasm and to predict that on its completion it will prove to be a monumental work for Cyprus.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
Hellenic College

Constance Head, **Justinian II of Byzantium**. Madison, Wisc. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1972. Pp. XI, 181. \$10.00.

The purpose of this book is to present an integrated picture of Justinian II, the person, the ruler, and his work. For several reasons, and perhaps because he has been overshadowed by Justinian the Great, Justinian II has remained a very obscure and, to a great degree unjustifiably, a maligned Emperor. Professor Head is to be commended for having undertaken the difficult job of rehabilitating the Emperor's name. To be sure, the author does not present any startling innovations for she has had no new sources to deal with. Nevertheless both the student and the scholar will find this a delightful book. Its crisp, straightforward and simple, even sensitive and at times poetic, style keeps the reader's interest very much alive. It includes every significant detail of Justinian's life and work and maintains a good balance.

The important question is, of course, whether the author's revisionist approach succeeds in its goal. Does Dr. Head prove that Justinian was not an inept megalomaniac and a cruel figure who used his imperial power for self-gratification, as historical opinion has maintained for many years? Professor Head acknowledges that Justinian II made very serious mistakes and that during his second reign he proved very cruel to his adversaries. But she also argues logically and convincingly that Justinian was an able ruler who initiated important administrative, military, religious, and diplomatic changes. Justinian's "first term" was both significant and constructive.

The author's treatment of the Council in Trullo is both perceptive and well done. On the significance of canon 62 and other canons for Greek classical survivals the author might have benefited from my article "Canon 62 of the Synod in Trullo and the Slavic Problem" (*Byzantina*, Vol. 2 (1970) pp. 21-35.) Most probably it was because of his role in the Council in Trullo that Justinian II was canonized by the Byzantine Church. F. G. Holweck and A. Fortescue, whose works Professor Head cites, erred when they wrote that Justinian's name has been expunged from the Orthodox Calendar. The official list of saints written by the specialist Sophronios Eustratiades and published by the Official Publishing House of the Church of Greece

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

APOPHATIC THEOLOGY AND DIVINE INFINITY IN ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA

By ROBERT S. BRIGHTMAN

I. Introduction

Among recent developments on the theological scene, an increase of interest in the patristic period is noteworthy.¹ Not only is the study of the Fathers seen as providing some ground-work in the continuing ecumenical dialogue, but more it is increasingly recognized that the Fathers were living and indeed lively theologians who have insights of significant relevance for today.

The present study deals with the theological approach of St. Gregory of Nyssa.² An exposition of the apophaticism used by St. Gregory as a tool in the battle against Eunomios will be followed by a statement of the relationship between the apophatic approach and St. Gregory's concept of divine infinity. An analysis of the position of other scholars on the question will be presented and finally conclusions will be stated.

II. The Apophatic Method

God cannot be given a Name, but he has many names. In sharp contrast to the position of Eunomios, St. Gregory insists that there is no one term which is able to describe in all its fulness the nature of God. In order to interpret the meaning of this position, it is first of all necessary to describe something of the position the heretic Eunomios was trying to defend.

For present purposes, the basic outline of Eunomios' position as it is stated in his *Apologia*³ will be an adequate statement. The central affirmation of this work is that God is "essence unbegotten." (*ousia agennetos*, PG, XXX, 841C.) Eunomios expands on this position by arguing that the existence of God as unbegotten does not depend upon any human ideas or thoughts (*epinoia*) since God existed as unbegotten before any man existed to think or speak of him. (841D-844A.) He also insists that to speak of God as unbegotten does not imply a privation (*steresis*) since this would imply the removal of a positive quality which is unthinkable (so Eunomios argues) in the case of the divine being.

(844A.) Eunomios then ties his whole thesis into one all-encompassing sentence:

But if the nature of God as unbegotten (*agennetos*) is neither to be understood in accordance with a conception of the human mind (*epinoian*), nor in terms of a privation (*steresin*) (as the preceding argument has demonstrated), nor in relation to a part of God only (for the unbegotten is without parts), nor as being in him as something different from him (for he is simple and uncomposed), nor as something else along side of him (for he is the one and only being that is unbegotten), then he must be the essence unbegotten (*ousia agennetos*; 844A-B).

By excluding other possible interpretations of the word "unbegotten," Eunomios thereby concludes that the word is, as Barmann puts it, an "adequate and exhaustive description" of the very essence of God. ("Christian Debate," p. 64.)

It might appear that it is the heretic who in this line of reasoning is upholding the majesty and glory of God. For to call God "essence unbegotten" and to deny any privation or division in the Godhead is a lofty conception. But another aspect of the picture must be kept in mind. When Eunomios describes God as in essence unbegotten, he is not only saying something about God; he is also saying something about man's ability to know God. For unbegotten does not represent a privation, but is a positive quality which man is able to know. For Eunomios, man is able to know God in his essence. Rather than glorifying God, Eunomios brings God down to manageable proportions so that he can be totally defined by man. The God who is in essence unbegotten is the God whose name man knows. The judgment of Hennessy is accurate: "The fundamental assumption of Eunomios' philosophical position is that the divine presence in itself is knowable to the human intellect. God, because of His absolute simplicity, cannot be a God of Mystery."⁴

If this be the position of Eunomios, it now becomes necessary to outline the thinking of St. Gregory of Nyssa as it matured over against the arguments of the heretic. Of fundamental importance is the way in which St. Gregory develops his idea of apophatic theology. Vladimir Lossky distinguishes this approach from the more usual cataphatic theology: "One--that of cataphatic or positive theology--proceeds by affirmations; the other--apophatic or negative theology, by negations. The first leads us to some knowledge of God, but is an imperfect way. The perfect way, the

only way which is fitting in regard to God, who is of His very nature unknowable, is the second--which leads us finally to total ignorance."⁵ With these definitions as a starting point, St. Gregory's thought may be examined in more detail.

Contrary to what might be expected, St. Gregory does not reject cataphatic theology; rather he insists that it be kept within its proper bounds. Indeed, St. Gregory grants a significant role to reason and to the use of human conception (*epinoia*).

Reality is as it is. But man is not able to know reality fully (here the apophatic emphasis is evident) even in his mind. He therefore forms a conception (*epinoia*) of that reality on the basis of analogy with human experience. But another step must be taken in order for communication to be possible. The conception must be reduced to word or language, and words are signs which refer to a conception of a reality. It may be seen that there are two steps in the process. First there is the movement from reality to conception. St. Gregory argues that reality as it is and as God knows it cannot be totally comprehended by human conception, but some pointers may be provided. There is then the second step in which the already imperfect conception is reduced to language. Words are imperfect symbols of a mental conception which points to a transcendent reality. Therefore mere words or names must not be absolutized as conveying a complete understanding of reality, but at the same time they do provide some useful hints.

It will be well to let St. Gregory speak for himself: ". . . all men of sense regard it as impracticable to indicate the ineffable Being by any force of words, because neither does our knowledge extend to the comprehension of what transcends knowledge, nor does the ministry of words have such power in us as to avail for the full enunciation of our thought, where the mind is engaged on anything eminently lofty and divine."⁶ Here the two problems referred to are clearly delineated. When St. Gregory says that "our knowledge (does not) extend to the comprehension of what transcends knowledge" he is insisting that human conception does not involve a complete knowledge of the divine reality. Then he goes on to say that it is impossible for words "to avail for the full enunciation of our thought." It is well for mortal man to maintain his humility, for the essence of God is "not to be conceived by the human intellect or expressed in words." (Eun., II, #105; PNF, 261A.)

This process of rational examination which involves the use of

words to express (imperfectly) human conceptions which in turn convey (again, even more imperfectly) the divine reality is very much of a human process. At the same time, the ability of men and women to think in this way is a gift of God. (See *Eun.*, II, #185; PNF, 268B.) The faculty for developing a conception is a gift from God; the actual development of a particular conception is a human process and must not be absolutized. It therefore becomes clear that reason--as expressed by language, since that is the only way man is able to express it--is a useful and in fact essential tool. But it remains a tool which provides some pointers and some hints about the nature of reality and does not provide any final answers. Thus, St. Gregory can argue "that reason supplies us with but a dim and imperfect comprehension of the Divine nature," but that the knowledge which we gain in this way "is sufficient for our limited capacity." (*Eun.*, II, #130; PNF, 263A.)

Positive affirmations such as reason provides cannot describe ultimate realities; instead they speak of relations and analogies and point to reality rather than describing its nature.⁷ Thus, even the term "Father" which St. Gregory prefers to the unscriptural expression "ungenerate" does not for St. Gregory "present to us the Essence, but only indicates the relation to the Son." (*Refut. conf.*, #16; PNF, 103B.) Whatever words are used, even though the words may be scriptural and even though they may describe a positive quality of God, they do not penetrate to the divine essence. There may be many a word which we "rightly attribute to the divine nature, but which does not express what that nature essentially is."⁸

If then St. Gregory ascribes to the cataphatic approach in theology a clear role to play, it is evident that this is a partial and limited role and that beyond the knowledge that can be attained by knowing, there is a deeper knowledge in not knowing. The cataphatic approach needs to be supplemented by apophaticism. For St. Gregory argues that human thought is able to attain a knowledge of the divine "in part by the touch of human reason, in part from its very inability to discern it, finding that it is a sort of knowledge to know that what is sought transcends knowledge." (*Eun.*, II, #139; PNF, 264A.) The point at which positive descriptions must cease and apophaticism prevail is the point at which the claim is made to know positively the nature and essence of God. It is for this reason that St. Gregory is enraged that the

Eunomians try to "limit the Divine Being, and all but openly idolize their own imagination, in that they deify the idea expressed by this 'ungeneracy' of theirs" (Eun., II, 100, PNF, 260B.) in the sense that this term is not just "a certain relation discernible in the Divine nature" but is to be understood "as being itself God, or the essence of God." This becomes idolatry: "For the divine Word forbids in the first place that the deity be compared to anything that is known by men, as all thoughts about the nature of God which are comprehended in the mind or in the intelligence form an idol of God and do not proclaim God." (Moysis, 2; Jaeger, VII/I, 87, 23--88, 5.) It is not that Gregory is here forbidding the use of reason or analogy. Rather, he forbids that reason should undertake to plumb the depths of the nature of God. "For God's nature cannot be named and is ineffable. . . . Every name. . . is indicative of our conception of the divine nature, but does not signify what that nature is in itself." (Tres dei, Jaeger, III/I, 42, 19--43, 2; Christology, 259.)

As the name apophatic or negative theology implies, one aspect of the approach is that it undertakes to tell of God "not what He is, but what He is not." (Eun., II, #192; PNF, 269A.) There are many ways in which terms can be used which instead of describing the nature of God tell what he is not. Thus "the privitive particle" denotes "the absence of what is not inherent" in God rather than "the presence of what is." (Eun., II #142; PNF, 264A.) St. Gregory then lists some examples of such terms: "harmless, painless, guileless, undisturbed, passionless, sleepless, undiseased, impassible, unblamable, and the like." (Eun., II, #142; PNF, 264A-B.) He then goes on to argue that "all these terms are truly applicable to God, and furnish a sort of catalogue and muster of evil qualities from which God is separate. Yet the terms employed give no positive account of that to which they are applied. We learn from them what it is not; but what it is, the force of words does not indicate." (Eun., II, #143; PNF, 264B.)

But apophaticism is more than just the use of the "privitive particle." It is a standing in silence in an attitude of wonder, love, and praise before the majesty of the transcendent God who is incomprehensible to the human mind. One does not finally seek to understand the meaning of God; he worships God. For man is different from God and cannot expect to stand on the same level with the Deity.⁹

Here it is that one comes to the heart of St. Gregory's a-

pophaticism. After all possible rational and scientific speculation has been carried out, man is called upon to be silent before the mystery of the incomprehensibility of God. Reason comes to a precipice over which it cannot pass. The soul finally comes to the place where it is "content now to know merely about the Transcendent, that it is completely different from the nature of the things that the soul knows." The consequence of this new knowledge is a new stance before God: "Thus it is, then, that when reason touches on those things which are beyond it, that is the time to keep silence (Eccles. 3.7)."¹⁰ When St. Gregory interprets the meaning of the promise of Jesus to the pure in heart that they shall see God (Mt. 5:8), he is careful to specify that this does not mean that man is "capable of perceiving the incomprehensible."¹¹ And in speaking of Moses, Gregory affirms the darkness which transcends seeing: "The true vision and true knowledge of what we seek consists precisely in not seeing, in an awareness that our goal transcends all knowledge and is everywhere cut off from us by the darkness of incomprehensibility." (Moysis, 2; Jaeger, VII/I. 87, 6-9; Glory, 118.)

This apophaticism is central to St. Gregory's theology. An adequate acknowledgement of the mystery of the transcendent is necessary in order to be able to understand other aspects of St. Gregory's thought. In particular is it true that St. Gregory's mystical theology (an examination of which is beyond the scope of this paper) can be adequately understood only in the light of his refutation of Eunomios and his affirmation of the incomprehensibility of God. To proceed with the issue directly at hand, apophaticism is also intimately related to St. Gregory's doctrine of the infinity of God.

III. Divine Infinity

St. Gregory's teaching on divine infinity is rich and diverse. It will therefore be necessary to approach the issue from several directions.

One of the most important differences between the creator and the creature may be discerned in the presence or absence of *diastema*. Ordinarily translated as "interval," this term is defined by Thunberg as meaning "distance in time and space."¹² It conveys the idea of spatial and temporal limitation and separation. *Diastema* is a characteristic of all creation, but is entirely absent in the creator.

As for the diastemic nature of all created things, St. Gregory

speaks as follows: "The creation, as we have said, comes into existence according to a sequence of order and is commensurate with the duration (*diastema*) of the ages, so that if one ascends along the line of things created to their beginning, one will bound the search with the foundation of those ages." (Eun., I, #362; PNF, 69A.) Even more specifically, he says that "the spatial element (*diastema*) is, of course, created." (Eccl., 7; Jaeger, V, 412, 14; *Glory*, 127.) Creation is thus characterized by the presence of *diastema*. This is not by way of condemnation of creation; it is simply to affirm its creatureliness.

But in contrast, the creator is marked by an utter absence of *diastema*. St. Gregory states the issue: "Now the Divine Nature is without extension (*adiastatos*), and, being without extension, it has no limit (*peras ouk ekei*), and that which is limitless is infinite (*apeiron*), and is spoken of accordingly."¹³ The apophatic nature of St. Gregory's affirmation about infinity is clear. While he speaks of the divine nature, he does not make a cataphatic definition of that nature as Eunomios had tried to do. Rather, he declares that the divine nature is without extension and without limit. Since these attributes of extension and limit are to be denied as defining God, it is appropriate to speak of God as infinite. But Gregory does not either here or elsewhere postulate an *ousia apeiros* to oppose the *ousia agennetos* of Eunomios. As he had insisted that Eunomios should do, St. Gregory remains silent before the mystery of what God is, and simply mentions some of the things which God is not. Here St. Gregory takes his hint from the inspired writers and argues that "The fact that the Divine greatness has no limit is proclaimed by prophecy, which declares expressly of His splendour, His glory, His holiness, 'there is no end.' (Ps. 145:3)" (Eun., III/I, #103; PNF, 146B.)

Eunomios had declared God to be *agennetos* and thereby had pointed to the fact that the First Cause has always existed. St. Gregory argues that God should also be understood to be without end. (Eun., I, #676; PNF, 98B.) But to apply both of these as names definitive of God, according to the method of Eunomios, would be to fall into contradiction. (Eun., I, #678-82; PNF, 98B-99A.) St. Gregory, in affirming that God is not only without beginning, but also without end, is as apophatic as ever. He is telling what cannot be said of God, he is not defining what God is.

The same thing is true when St. Gregory speaks of God as "single and absolutely one." (Eun., I, #235; PNF, 57B.) Once

again, he does not define God and give him the name "One;" rather he speaks of God's nature as being "incapable of deteriorating" (Eun., I, #236; PNF, 57B.) so that his goodness knows no limit and is thus infinite.

Another way in which St. Gregory approaches the idea of the infinity of God is through the contemplation of the fact that He is. The starting point here is God's revelation of Himself to Moses: "One mark of the true Godhead is indicated by the words of Holy Scripture, which Moses learnt by voice from heaven, when He [sic] heard Him who said, 'I am He that is.' We think it right, then, to believe that to be truly Divine which is represented as eternal and infinite in respect of being; and all that is contemplated therein is always the same, neither growing nor being consumed." (Eun., III/IV, #3: PNF, 200B.) There is a sense in which the very fact that God is implies his infinity. And the fact of God's existence is indeed the only thing we can really know of him. Thus St. Gregory argues; "Moses lays down as a law for us some such mark of true Godhead as this, that we know nothing else of God but this one thing, that he is (for to this point the words 'I am He that is')." ¹⁴ That fact that God is is indeed affirmed positively, but God's existence as the infinite one is determined apophatically. For God's infinity is understood in terms of the fact that God never was nor will be non-existent. St. Gregory rejects "all the sophistical fabrication about the non-existence at some time of Him who truly is," and affirms that God, as the eternal one, "is never at any time found to be non-existent." This infinite eternity covers both past and future, for "the eternity of the Father is marked by His never terminating His being in non-existence." (Eun., III/IV, #9-11; PNF, 201B.) Once again the apophatic nature of St. Gregory's talk about God is clear.

That God is incomprehensible has already been shown in the discussion of apophatic theology. But the idea is also related to the infinity of God. The human mind, with its diastemic nature, is not able to "comprehend a nature that has no dimension" *ten adiaiston*; (Eccl., 7; Jaeger, V, 412, 18-20; Glory, 127). The divine is not subject to any of the limitations of human nature; indeed, it is "beyond the reach not only of the human but of the angelic and of all supramundane intelligence, unthinkable, unutterable, above all expression in words, having but one name that can represent His proper nature, the single name of being 'Above

every name.' ”¹⁵ This very way of speaking, intended as an affirmation of the incomprehensibility of God, can also be viewed as a statement regarding his infinity. Indeed, the apophatic nature of the theological enterprise and the infinity of God are closely related. Thus Gregory speaks: “For He Who is believed to transcend the universe must surely transcend speech. He who tries to circumscribe the infinite (to *aoriston*) in speech no longer admits that He is transcendent by the very fact that he equates God with his speech, under the impression that the proper description of God is only such as his discourse is capable of expressing. He is unaware that the proper notion of the supreme Being is preserved precisely in our belief that God transcends knowledge.” (Eccl., 7; Jaeger, V, 411, 8-14; *Glory*, 126.) Here St. Gregory, in what is itself an apophatic statement, identifies the incomprehensibility and the infinite. And even this statement is limited. For in the final analysis, St. Gregory does not even make apophatic statements about God, he simply worships: “Ah the wonder of it! Why does the sacred text fear to approach the glory of the divine mystery, so that it has not even expressed any of those effects which are outside his nature? It does not say that God’s essence is without limits, judging it rash even to express this in a concept; rather it merely marvels at the vision of the magnificence of His glory.”¹⁶ Then all theological speculation is laid aside and the only attitude appropriate to man is the attitude of praise.

The thesis developed in this section may be summarized by giving two series of questions, as they might be asked of St. Gregory of Nyssa. The first series may be put as follows:

- Is there any diastema in God?
- Is there any limitation in God?
- Does God have any beginning or end?
- Does God have any parts?
- Is it possible for man to know God?

From the present study, it is clear that St. Gregory would answer each of these questions with a firm “No.” And the “No” would be expressed with a sense of reverence and worship in the presence of a God who transcends any human limitations and definitions.

The second set of questions, patterned after the first set as to subject matter, would evoke a very different kind of response

from St. Gregory:

Does the lack of *diastema* define the nature of God?

Does the word "infinite" define God?

Does the endlessness of God along with his beginninglessness describe his essence?

Does the unity of God define his nature?

Is the incomprehensibility of God definitive of his being?

Once again, in each case, the answer given by St. Gregory would be a firm "No." But this time it would be an outraged "No," a horrified "No," a scandalized "No." It is not for man to define God; rather it is for man to worship God.

IV. Apophaticism and Infinity

Note must be taken in this connection of several recent works which have given a different interpretation to the meaning of divine infinity in St. Gregory of Nyssa. The analysis of St. Gregory's doctrine as it has been presented by three men, namely James Hennessy, Ekkehard Mühlenberg and Bernard Barmann will be evaluated.

One receives a hint that Hennessy¹⁷ fails to understand the basic thrust of St. Gregory's theology on reading the following sentence: "When one reads the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa, it is somewhat surprising to realize that he stresses more frequently what we cannot know about God rather than what we can know about him." (205) Why surprising? The fact that man cannot know the essence of God is at the heart of St. Gregory's theology. Hennessy is concerned to show that "man can learn some very important truths about the nature of this Uncreated essence." (209) But the main truth which Hennessy then puts forth as an instance relates to the radical difference between created natures and the uncreated, and this is clearly a negative kind of knowledge. Hennessy accurately recognizes that it is impossible in St. Gregory's thought to give a name to God in the sense of thereby defining and delimiting the divine nature. But when Hennessy comes to speak specifically of divine infinity, his confusion becomes evident.

Hennessy begins his inquiry into divine infinity by stating the task as seeking to discover "if the divine perfection is limited in any way whatsoever." (251) He then proceeds to build his case by citing references to St. Gregory. It is worth noting that in his summaries, Hennessy preserves St. Gregory's apophatic language:

His knowledge is omniscience--without any restrictions whatsoever. (253)

So too His power is beyond limitation. (254)

The Divine goodness. . . has no limit. (256)

God's beauty is boundless, and His greatness unlimited. (257)

Thus far Hennessy is accurately describing the teachings of St. Gregory. But when Hennessy goes on to inquire if God's nature is unlimited and infinite, he begins to go astray. Although the passages which he cites from St. Gregory are apophatic (258), Hennessy implies that St. Gregory is making a positive affirmation about the divine nature.

Specifically, Hennessy declares that "Gregory sees the divine nature entirely free of any limitations whatsoever." (259) This is an accurate, apophatic interpretation. But on the same page Hennessy goes on to argue in these words: "Now to be unlimited according to Gregory, is the same as to be infinite." This is indeed what St. Gregory says. But Hennessy invests the word "infinite" with an absolute cataphatic quality which is entirely absent in St. Gregory. Hennessy would have St. Gregory answer "Yes" to the second set of questions noted above. This movement is especially obvious when Hennessy quotes an apophatic passage from St. Gregory (Cant., 5; Jaeger, VI, 157, 14-158, 1; Glory, 189.) and then observes, on the evidence of this passage, that "Clearly, God is infinite absolutely." (261) Thus Hennessy is able to conclude his dissertation by stating as one of his basic findings that St. Gregory taught the "doctrine of positive and qualitative divine infinity." (292) But the present study has shown that the infinity which St. Gregory taught was negative and apophatic rather than positive and qualitative. The difference is basic, and is in fact symbolized by the two sets of questions noted above.

The approach of Mühlenberg¹⁸ is more sophisticated and complex than is the case with Hennessy. It is impossible to make a hasty judgment on Mühlenberg, since he makes some fine distinctions and does not pursue a one-sided approach.

A number of passages in Mühlenberg seem to support the idea that he is ascribing a cataphatic theological stance to St. Gregory. Of St. Gregory's statement that "Gott ist unendlich!" Mühlenberg observes "Das ist eine Aussage, die die negative Theologie der älteren Väter nie gemacht hat." (92) This would seem to imply that St. Gregory is rejecting the negative theology of Clement for some superior approach, when in fact St. Gregory is fulfilling

Clement's apophaticism. Again, Mühlenberg says "Gregor von Nyssa setzt der negativen Theologie des Eunomius die Vorstellung der Unendlichkeit Gottes entgegen." (118) But it is not Eunomios who upholds negative theology, it is Gregory. Yet Mühlenberg says "Der negativen Theologie ist Gregor von Nyssa überlegen." (144) More specifically, Mühlenberg acknowledges that "das Unendliche" does not define the essence of God's nature but rather is "ein Begriff des menschlichen Denkens." At the same time, he goes on to argue: "Aber es ist ein Begriff, der mit keinem anderen Begriff der negativen Theologie zu vergleichen ist." (198) The reason for this superiority is described in these words: "Alle anderen auf Gott übertragenen Eigenschaften beziehen sich nur je auf einen Teilaspekt seiner Offenbarung. Im Unenlichen wird versucht, das Ganze zu erfassen." (198) But Mühlenberg goes even further, and says of "das Unendliche" that "Es ist dasjenige, was nicht zu Ende gedacht werden kann. Diesen 'Begriff' macht er zum Wesenprädikat für Gott." (202) But even though **Begriff** be put in quotation marks and even though the content of the **Begriff** be stated in apophatic terms, it is difficult to imagine that St. Gregory would ever want to say that any "Begriff" can be a "Wesenprädikat für Gott."¹⁹

But it must also be noted that there are ways in which Mühlenberg stresses the apophatic approach very strongly. For instance; he affirms that "to aoriston soll also ausdrücken, dass das gottliche Wesen an sich selbst keine Grenze besitzt." (102) Further, in accordance with St. Gregory's analysis of the revelation to Moses, Mühlenberg agrees that "'Gott ist' ist demnach die einzige Gotteserkenntnis." This thought is developed in an interesting way: "'Gott ist' und 'Gott ist unendlich' sind für ihn (Gregor) zwei gleiche Aussagen. Wenn ein wahrhafter Gott jetzt ist, dann muss er auch immer gewesen sein. Zu seinem Sein gehört die Unendlich hinzu." (197) If Mühlenberg means to be saying--as may be the case--the statement that God is infinite has the same absolute force as the statement that God is, then Mühlenberg must be classed with Hennessy. One further passage seems to support an apophatic understanding of St. Gregory in Mühlenberg: "Denn das Unendliche ist kein Begriff, der das zu bezeichnende Wesen beweiskräftig umschließt." (199) This is a wholesome statement, and would appear to contradict the affirmation cited earlier that the infinite is a **Wesenprädikat für Gott**. Even more important as supporting an apophatic understanding is the following: "Bezieht man die Behauptung des Eunomius auf die Argumentation

Gregors, die auf to apeiron stützt, so ist Gottes Sein nicht nur durch gennetos begrenzt, sondern auch durch agennetos. Gott ist nämlich dann begrenzt, wenn sein Wesen in einen solchen Begriff gefasst wird, der eine gnosis ermöglicht." (201) But what is still not quite clear is the question whether Mühlenberg understands that even the term "infinite" cannot be used as a description of the divine being in any absolute sense, since thus to define God is to limit him.

What conclusion, then, may be arrived at with regard to Mühlenberg's interpretation of St. Gregory's doctrine of divine infinity? Several points may be noted in a final evaluation. For one thing, Mühlenberg argues that the incomprehensibility of God is grounded in the divine infinity. (199-200) The present study has confirmed the close relationship between the two concepts. However, it may be questioned whether for St. Gregory the incomprehensibility of God is not prior to his infinity rather than the other way around as argued by Mühlenberg. At least from the epistemological point of view, it would appear that St. Gregory is arguing that we discover that God is incomprehensible and that the fact that he is infinite is learned afterwards. Further, from a logical point of view, it would appear that St. Gregory would want to say that the infinity of God is a function of his incomprehensibility, rather than the reverse. At this point, then, Mühlenberg, while rightly stressing the importance of divine infinity, has gone too far in giving it first place in St. Gregory's thought.

Two more passages may serve to indicate the still ambivalent position which Mühlenberg holds. In a carefully worded statement, he argues as follows: "Auch die Vorstellung von der Unendlichkeit ist nur eine vorläufige Gottesbestimmung. Aber sie ist den Gottesprädikaten der negativen Theologie überlegen, weil sie an sich selbst die Vorläufigkeit aussagt. Die Unendlichkeit impliziert, dass Gottes Wesen der menschlichen Vernunft in Wahrheit transzendent bleibt, ohne ihr jedoch so fern zu rücken, dass sie die Transzendenz nicht mehr aussagen könnte." (202). It would appear that this statement is a summary of Mühlenberg's position. It affirms the transcendence of the divine essence, but at the same time insists that man is able to speak of this transcendence. This would be legitimate if man's thus speaking were clearly understood to be a mere pointing by analogy and not definitive. But this Mühlenberg does not make clear. Even so, Mühlenberg does recognize the doxological significance of the

divine infinity: "Die Bestimmung des Menschen ist aber ausgerichtet auf Gott. Allein in seinem Streben zu Gott, den er nicht zu Ende denken kann, aber dessen Wesen seinem Denken in dem sich selbst aufhebenden Begriff der Unendlichkeit gegenwärtig ist, wird er die Erfüllung seines Wesens finden." (205) In these sentences, which come at the very end of Mühlenberg's book, the sense of wonder before God is to be felt. But Mühlenberg speaks still of the divine essence, although he only suggests that a thought is "present" and not that the essence is defined. But when all points are taken into consideration, Mühlenberg's thesis must be rejected as forcefully as is Hennessy's, for Mühlenberg's seemingly valid statements are finally negated by his attempts to ascribe to St. Gregory words that speak of the nature of the divine essence. This St. Gregory does not do.

The position of Barmann²⁰ also deserves careful consideration. Barmann begins his discussion of St. Gregory's critique of classical metaphysics by arguing that for St. Gregory, God is infinite because there is no *diastema* in him. The fact that God is thus unlimited Barmann sees as a decisive break with the traditional Platonic view that God is "finite and hence comprehensible." (313) Barmann points out that for the Greeks, the power of reason was unlimited and could "encompass all that had meaning" and the infinite, since it cannot be comprehended by reason, does "not belong to the domain of being and perfection, but to that of non-being." Hence for the Greeks, "God was considered finite." (314) Barmann rightly understands Eunomios to represent this traditional point of view, for Eunomios claims "to comprehend [God's] *ousia*" and for him "God is comprehensible because he is finite." (315) But then Barmann argues that Eunomios' concept of *agennesia* is a negative concept whereas St. Gregory's notion of infinity is positive. Barmann declares: "Thus infinity (*to apeiron*) is synonymous with eternity (*to aidion*) and is a positive notion, while *agennesia* is only a negative conception, as we shall see." (317) This statement is doubly false. *Agennesia* is for Eunomios not a negative but a positive term. In part II the passage was quoted from Eunomios' *Apologia* 8, where Eunomios insists that his use of the term *unbegotten* does not imply any privation in God since this would involve the removal of a positive quality which is unthinkable in the case of the divine being. *Agennesia* is a positive term, defining the divine nature, in Eunomios' understanding.

On the other hand, *to apeiron* is for St. Gregory, in spite of

what Barmann says, a negative notion. To be sure, Barmaan acknowledges that there are negative meanings to the term *apeiron*. (324-25) But he then devotes an entire section to "The Metaphysical Arguments for an Actual Infinity." (332-44) Barmann builds his case on two passages from the *Contra Eunomium*. The first of these (*Eun.*, I, 167-71; PNF, 51B-52A.) deals with the unchangeable nature of God. But this is a negative statement, for it affirms that there is no change in God. The second passage (*Eun.*, I, #231-35; PNF, 57A-B.) deals with the simplicity of God. Now simplicity sounds more like a positive concept than unchangeable. But St. Gregory uses the term in an apophatic way since for him it means uncomposed and without parts.

Barmann then has failed in his attempt to demonstrate an "actual infinity" in the teaching of St. Gregory. Indeed, if there were an actual infinity in St. Gregory, it would mean that to the degree that the infinity was actual, to that same degree the infinity would be comprehensible. Barmann has made a great contribution to the study of St. Gregory of Nyssa, but at this particular point he is inconsistent both with himself and with St. Gregory.

V. Conclusions

The major conclusion of this paper is that apophaticism is central in the theological approach of St. Gregory of Nyssa. The attempt to show that the presentation of a new understanding of divine infinity is St. Gregory's central contribution must be rejected unless it be clearly understood that St. Gregory's understanding of the infinity of God derives from his apophatic approach. Even St. Gregory's defense of the full equality of the three persons of the Trinity in opposition to Eunomios' subordinationism must be understood in relationship to St. Gregory's insistence that God the Father cannot finally be defined as the essence unbegotten--an apophatic concern. Any study of St. Gregory of Nyssa which does not give adequate treatment to his apophaticism is *ipso facto* defective.

Furthermore, it may be suggested that this apophatic concern has some relevance for the contemporary theological scene. Here, the conclusions must be more tentative and are better stated in the form of questions than as positive statements. Thus it may be inquired whether St. Gregory's theological approach may uncover a kernel of truth in the death of God theologies. May it perhaps be that it is the cataphatically defined god who is known to be "up

there" who has died? Again, in an ecumenical perspective, one may well ask how many of the polemics involved in some of the schisms of the past have been related to opposing cataphatic statements. How differently would the issues look if they were to be stated in apophatic form? And more profoundly, how deeply would our perspectives be changed if we all followed the doxological approach? Answers to such questions as these must be deferred to the future.

BOSTON COLLEGE

FOOTNOTES

1. The present paper is based in large part on the author's unpublished doctoral dissertation, "Gregory of Nyssa and John Wesley in Theological Dialogue on the Christian Life," submitted to the faculty at Boston University Graduate School in 1969.
2. While the article by George S. Bebis, "Gregory of Nyssa's 'De Vita Moysis' A Philosophical and Theological Analysis," **Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, XII (1967), pp. 369-93, deals with a different aspect of St. Gregory's thought from the present paper, Bebis' conclusions are essentially in conformity with those presented here. See especially pp. 390-92.
3. **Patrologia cursus completus**. . . .Series Graeca. . . .Accurante J.-P. Migne (Paris), XXX, 835ff. (Hereafter referred to as PG. Where no English translation is cited, the text is translated from the Greek by the author). The entire controversy between Eunomios and the Cappadocians is thoroughly treated in Bernard Charles Barmann, "A Christian Debate of the Fourth Century A Critique of Classical Metaphysics" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1966.) (Hereafter referred to as "Christian Debate.") The author is indebted to this most helpful work. For a discussion of the **Apologia** of Eunomios, see pp. 1-65. An outline of the major documents of the Eunomian controversy is given on pp. xiv-xv.

4. James Emmet Hennessy, S.J., "The Background, Sources, and Meaning of Divine Infinity in St. Gregory of Nyssa" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Forham, 1963), p. 26. (Hereafter referred to as "Divine Infinity.")
5. Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Translated by members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1957), p. 25
6. *Contra Eunomium*, Book II, par. #61; Wernerus Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Auxilio aliorum virorum doctorum edenda curavit, 9 vols, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952-) (Hereafter referred to as Jaeger. References to the *Contra Eunomium* and the *Refutatio confessionis Eunomii* are designated *Eun.* and *Refut. conf.* with the book and paragraph number as indicated in Jaeger.), Phillip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *Gregory of Nyssa: Dogmatic Treatises, etc.* (Second Series, Vol V of A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., (1892) n.d., p. 256A. (Hereafter referred to as PNF. When a translation of Gregory is cited, the English as quoted is taken from that translation; in each case, the English has been compared with the Greek text as cited.)
7. *Eun.*, II, #104, PNF, 260B, see Adam Krampf, *Der Urzustand des Menschen nach der Lehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa: Eine dogmatische-patristische Studie* (Würzburg: Druck und Verlag von F. X. Bucher, 1889), p. 26.
8. *Tres dei*, Jaeger, III/I, 43 17-20, Edward Hardie Rochie and Cyril C. Richardson, eds., *Christology of the Later Fathers* (Vol. III of Library of the Christian Classics, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, n.d.), p. 259. (Hereafter referred to as *Christology*.)
9. Gregory cites the example of Abraham as one who set out on a journey to a land which he did not know at the command of a God whose name he did not know as a way of showing that it is well to recognize that the greatness of God is not limited by our misconceptions of the deity, but that God is greater than man can understand. *Eun.*, II, #84-96, PNF, 259A-260A.
10. *Eccl.*, 7, Jaeger, V, 414, 7-10, *From Glory to Glory: Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings* (Selected and with an Introduction by Jean Daniélou, S.J., translated and edited by Herbert Musurillo, S.J., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 128. (Hereafter referred to as *Glory*.)
11. *Beat.*, 6, PG, XLIV, 1068B, Hilda Graef, trans., *St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Lord's Prayer, The Beatitudes* (Vol. XVIII of Ancient Christian Writers, Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1954), p. 146.
12. Lars Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1965), p. 6.
13. *Eun.*, III/IV, #33; PNF, 215B. See *Eun.*, I, #363 and #366; PNF, 69A and 69B; also *Eun.*, II, #459, PNF, 296A.
14. *Eun.*, III/IV, #8; PNF, 201A; see *Eun.*, II, #71, PNF 257B, *Eun.*, II, 98, PNF, 260A, *Eun.*, III/IV, #56-60, PNF, 198.

15. **Eun.**, I, #683, PNF, 99B; see **Eun.**, III/I, #107-8, PNF, 147A-B.
16. **Eccl.**, 7, Jaeger, V, 415; 2-7, **Glory**, 128; See **Eun.**, III/IV, #4, PNF, 201A: "There is one name significant of the Divine Nature--the wonder, namely, that arises in our hearts concerning it."
17. In "Divine Infinity" (see footnote #4 for full data). Page references to this work are indicated in the following pages in parentheses.
18. In Ekkehard Mühlenberg, **Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa: Gregors Kritik am Gottesbegriff der klassischen Metaphysik** (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Band XVI, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966). Page references to this work are indicated in the following pages in parentheses.
19. It may be noted that **Begriff** is a more satisfactory translation of **epinoia** than any word available in English.
20. In "Christian Debate" (see footnote #3 for full data). Page references to this work are indicated in the following pages in parentheses.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

SUPPLEMENT

PART II

Continued from

Vol. XVII, Numbers 1 & 2

Spring - Fall 1973

**THE ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS LIBRARY
OF ECCLESIASTICAL AND HISTORICAL SOURCES**

NO. 2

N. M. Vaporis, General Editor

**CODEX (Γ') GAMMA
OF THE
ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE**

by

Nomikos Michael Vaporis

PART II

51 (41)

DECLARATION

Enypographon kai emmartyron gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

12 October 1699, Indiction 8

Kavaselas the son of Ioannes, husband of Theologina who is the niece of archon Manolakes the furrier¹ declares and confirms that Metropolitan Kallinikos of Euripos² has paid in full a promissory note of 1550 grosia.

The note resulted from a loan made by Manolakes to one of Kallinikos' predecessors, and the present declaration follows the death of Manolakes, whose estate was distributed among his heirs. The promissory note in question was inherited by his niece Theologina and had been signed by the then Metropolitan of Euripos³ and countersigned by his successors, including Kallinikos the present incumbent.

Confirmed by: †Patriarch [Kallinikos] of Constantinople

Consented to by: †Zoe, wife of the late Alexandrakes, †Sultana, †Roxandra, wife of the late Manolakes

Witnessed by: †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Grand Skevophlax Manolakes,⁴ Protekdikos Spantones,⁵ †Dikaiophylax Choumouzes,⁶ †Grand Primmekerios Parakevas,⁷ †Hypomnematographos Manouel,⁸ †Ostiarios Theodorakes⁹

Monokondylion

1. Manolakes, known as the furrier from his occupation as well as Manolakes the Kastorian, or simply archon Manolakes, was an extremely successful businessman and provider of furs for the

Sultan's court. Moreover, he had an unusual interest in and love for education.

He provided the money for the founding of a new school, an extension of the Patriarchal School in 1663 which the Patriarchate organized in three divisions: elementary, secondary, and university. The older school, then under the direction of Ioannes Karyophylles, had become stagnant and was under attack because of its director's real or suspected Calvinism. It was simply permitted to die out.

Manolakes also provided salaries for teachers and full scholarships for students. Previous to this, he also founded or substantially supported schools in Arta, Chios, Kastoria, and elsewhere. He was one of the few wealthy archons who substantially benefited both the Orthodox Church and the Greeks during the Ottoman period. He died sometime before the date of this document. T. Gritsopoulos, *Patriarchike Megale tou Genous Schole* (Athens, 1966), I, 211-25.

2. See above No. 46.

3. Perhaps Amvrosios (before 1687-1698) who was transferred to Nauplion & Argos. Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, V, 1072 but Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XV, 1423) does not list Amvrosios.

4. Grand Skevophylax Manolakes should be placed between Balases who served in this office from Mar./Apr. 1691-21 Oct. 1693 and Skarlatos cited in 1705. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, 136. For this office see *ibid.*, pp. 26-27. This is the first attestation of Manolakes as Grand Skevophylax that I have encountered.

5. See above No. 1, n 34.

6. See above No. 1, n 35.

7. Grand Primmekerios Paraskevas served between Diamantes, cited in 1683 and Laskarakes in 1701. He also served the Patriarchate as Protoapostolarios, 15 Mar. 1681-Jan. 1691 and as Dikaiophylax, 10 Feb. 1705-16 Nov. 1707. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 131, 134. This is his first attestation as Grand Primmekerios. For this office see Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, X, 586-87.

8. Manouel had been previously attested from 29 Jan.-16 Nov. 1707. His appearance above extends his chronology forward to 12 Oct. 1699-16 Nov. 1707. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 20, 85, 131.

9. Ostiarios Theodorakes had been attested from 15 Apr. 1690-27 Oct. 1693. Now his dates may be extended to 12 Oct. 1699. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 38, 76.

52 (44b)

FALSE BISHOP

Patriarchike kai synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

October 1699, Indiction 8

Addressed to the Archbishop of Siphnos,¹ the officials, clergy, and archons of his see, informing them that a certain Nikodemos is unknown as a bishop. He is in fact a hiermonk who left his monastery and had travelled about in unknown places and had not received a canonical ordination as bishop. Consequently, "Evil-Nikodemos" is declared to be unfrocked and divested of all priestly rank and dignity. He is a monk. Anyone who co-celebrates with him and honors him as a bishop or accepts his blessing is suspended if a clergyman, and anathematized if a layman.

Monokondylion

1. In the latest published list (Avoures, TEE, XI, 602) only one hierarch, Athanasios (1646) is recorded in the seventeenth century and only one, Kallinikos (1797/98) in the eighteenth. Mystakides (EEBS, XII 1936 216) adds Timotheos from 1674-Jan. 1678.

53 (42)

CONFIRMATION

Sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

November 1699, Indiction 8

The stavropegeion rank of the Monastery of St. Konstantinos, in the village of Astos, metropolis of Naupaktos & Arta, is confirmed.

As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate,

the monastery is required to pay 2 gold florins annually.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kallinikos of Euripos, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion

Cited: Aimilianos, p. 475. Aimilianos, however, cites the document as having reference to the stavropegion village of Aptou.

54 (47)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon kai synodikon emmartyron
epivevaioterion sygilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II
January 1700, Indiction 8

Hegoumenos Theophanes petitions and receives confirmation of the stavropegion rank of the Monastery of the Transfiguration on the Strophades Islands,¹ which lie near the islands of Kephallenia and Zakynthos.

As a sign of its dependency, the monastery is to send to the Patriarchate 90 liters of raisins annually.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Sophia,² †Kallinikos of Euripos, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantinos of Ganos & Chora.

Monokondylion

Cited: Gedeon, Pinakes, p. 613; Aimilianos (p. 475) omits reference to the Strophades Islands as does Karapiperes, p. 109.

1. The monastery was founded initially under Emperor Theodore Laskares in 1241. See S.N.A., TEE, XI, 498.

2. In the MS: January 1700-18 May 1701; Nos. 54, 74, 75. Inclusive dates: 1695-18 May 1701, resigned. Germanos (Thrakika, VIII, 168) does not record an initial date. It is likely that Gregorios was elected about 1695, the date appearing on his seal below in No. 74.

55 (48)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchikon synodikon epivevaioterion gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

January 1700, Indiction 8

The Archbishop of Samos¹ is instructed to make an annual payment of 10,000 aspers to Metropolitan Parthenios, formerly of Drystra.² Parthenios had resigned from his see and now finds himself in great financial need and without any sources of income. The money is to be derived from the zetia of Samos.

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylon

1. In the latest list of hierarchs of Samos (Konstantinides, TEE, X, 1143-44) Gedeon (see above No. 6) is attested in 1696, followed by Misael from 1718-1725. Konstantinides, however, missed Manouel Gedeon's attestation of Gregorios on 7 April 1701 (see his *Ephemerides*, pp. 199-200). The archbishop referred to above is, therefore, either Gedeon or Gregorios.

2. Parthenios was succeeded in Drystra c. Mar. 1691 by Athanasios who signs the present document. Inclusive dates: Feb. 1687-Mar. 1689. Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 139; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 827. For Athanasios, also see above No. 1, n 26.

56 (48)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

25 April 1700, Indiction 8

Bishop Neophytos of Santorine resigns from his see in order to retire to a "quiet life" and to relieve himself of the necessity of "traveling to Constantinople." Patriarch [Kallinikos II] and the Holy Synod are given "permission" to ordain another in his place.

†Archbishop Neophytos, formerly of Santorine.¹

1. See above No. 28.

57 (45)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

25 April 1700, Indiction 8

Hieromonk Zacharias is elected Archbishop of Santorine¹ to succeed Neophytos who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Kyrillos and Hieromonk Neophytos

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Proilavo,³ Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 137

1. In the MS: 25 Apr. 1700; Inclusive dates: Elected, 25 Apr. 1700-c1740. After forty years as an archbishop, Zacharias was accused of being a Latinophil. He was forced to submit a personal

confession of faith to the Patriarchate which was then satisfied. See Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 137.

2. See above No. 28.

3. In the MS: 25 Apr.-July 1700; Nos. 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63. Inclusive dates: Unknown.

58 (45-46)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon kai synodikon epivevaioterion sigilliodes gramma
Patriarch Kallinikos II
April 1700, Indiction 8

Patriarch Kallinikos II answers a petition received from the cenobite nunnery of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker, in the Kastelion of Skaros, on the island of Santorine, seeking confirmation of its **stavropegion** rank. All of the monastery's old patriarchal and synodical documents pertaining to its rank are declared to be valid "forever." As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, the monastery is required to commemorate the patriarch's name in all of its services and to contribute one dozen napkins annually.

The monastery is further declared to be free of all outside interference. Neither the Archbishop of Santorine, the patriarchal exarch, or anyone else may interfere in any way with its affairs. Moreover, the monastery and its properties are free from all financial obligations to anyone, nor are its clergymen: the **proestos**,¹ the **oikonomos**, the **ephemerios**, required to pay the **philotimon**, the **kanonikon**, or anything else. They are descendants (although not directly) of the founders of the monastery, the Gizeses, and were placed in their position by the Lagkadades family with the consent of the sisterhood.

The monastery will maintain the cenobite order and may not change to an idiorythmic without the consent and approval of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It shall be headed by a **hegoumene** (abbess) and have a sub-hegoumene, who is also the **portarisa** (door keeper), a

sakellarisa, and a skevophylakisa.²

Access to the monastery is forbidden to all outsiders except for servants, when necessary, under the direction of the **hegoumene**. Nuns may not leave the monastery except for some great and real need, nor may they speak to anyone, relatives or not, male or female, without the permission of the **hegoumene**.

The nuns as well as the **oikonomos** and the **ephe-merios** are prohibited from giving away anything belonging to the monastery without the approval of the **hegoumene**. Finally, the **oikonomos** is required to give to the **hegoumene** a general accounting of the income of the monastery.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Proilavo, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Gedeon, **Pinakes**, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 109.

1. Here an ecclesiastical title: the head clergyman.

2. Female counterparts of the offices of **portares**, **sakellarios**, and **skevophylax**.

59 (49)

INVALIDATION

Epivevaioterion gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

April 1700, Indiction 8

Patriarch Kallinikos II and the Holy Synod rule that the election of Bishop Makarios of Metra [& Athyra]¹ as Metropolitan of [Naupaktos &] Arta is invalid since he was unable, due to the opposition of the local people, to assume his ecclesiastical charge. Makarios' status remains that of **monoepiskopos**.² He retains his episcopal rank and is declared to be a genuine hierarch

eligible for transfer later.

The invalidation of the election and the synodical ruling is based on past precedent. Under Emperor Manouel I Komnenos Porphyrogennetos,³ Hierodeacon of the Great Church Eustathios⁴ was elected Metropolitan of Myra in Lykia of Asia Minor. Before his ordination, however, an imperial decree invalidated the election. Later Eustathios was elected Metropolitan of Thessalonike. This was not considered a second election at the time.

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Proilavo, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylon. Menologema.

Text: Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 73-76. Gedeon only notes the year and does not include the signatories.

1. See above No. 22.

2. That is, a bishop who had been elected once. Although second and third elections and, consequently, transfers were frequently practiced, there seems to have been an uneasiness about this. The ideal, held in theory at least, was that an episcopal election was like a marriage and should not be dissolved. Circumstances, however, modified this rule in both instances.

The practice of transfers was not a characteristic of the Ottoman period alone, but took place during the Byzantine as well. In the former period, the bishop assumed the title of his see for the first three elections. If he were elected a fourth time, he did not assume the title of the see, but was known as its **proedros**. For the number of transfers during both periods and a canonical examination of the subject, see Zacharias Mathas, *Katalogos . . . Patriarchon* (2d ed. Athens, 1884), Note 172, pp. 258-74.

3. Ruled: 1143-1180.

4. Eustathios had been elected Metropolitan of Myra in 1174. In the same year, Metropolitan Konstantinos of Thessalonike died. It was at this point that the emperor intervened and had Eustathios' election set aside. In the following year, Eustathios was elected Metropolitan of Thessalonike and remained in office to c 1197. See Bones, TEE, V, 1092.

60 (50)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

28 April 1700, [Indiction 8]

Bishop Makarios of Metra [& Athyra]¹ is elected Metropolitan of Anchialos² to succeed Daniel who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Neophytos and Hieromonk Parthenios

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Proilavo, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. See above No. 22.

2. In the MS: 28 Apr.-May 1700; Nos. 60, 62. Inclusive dates: Elected, 28 Apr. 1700-1713; Gritsopoulos, TEE, I, 337; Germanos, Thrakika, VIII, 122-23.

3. See above No. 24, n 8.

61 (50b-51)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchikon kai synodikon epivevaioterion gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

May 1700, Indiction 8

The Holy Synod confirms and declares that the monastery of Amasgos belongs to the metropolis of Nemesos (Lemesos) & Kytion [in Cyprus] and not to the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

This action is made necessary because Metropolitan Leontios of Nemesos & Kytion¹ had, sixty-seven years previously [1633], with the consent of three laymen,

given the monastery to Patriarch Gerasimos I of Alexandria.² But Patriarch Gerasimos, knowing that such a gift was illegal (ecclesiastical property is inviolable and nontransferable), returned ownership of the monastery in writing, as did the present Patriarch Gerasimos II of Alexandria.³ Copies of the latter's letter were signed by Archbishop Germanos of Cyprus⁴ and his bishops. All the documents were sent to the Holy Synod in Constantinople.

The above ruling and confirmation was petitioned for and received by Metropolitan Ioannikios of Nemesos & Kytion.⁵

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Proilavo, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion

Text: Delikanes, II, 562-66. Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 110.

1. Cited from 1631-43. See Kostas Chatzepsaltes, "Hoi meta ton Germanon akmasantes episkopoi Amathountos Lemesou kai Kitiou mechri ton meson tou 12 aionos," *Kypriakai Spoudai*, XXIX (1965), p. 76.

2. Gerasimos was born in Crete and served the Church of Alexandria under Patriarch Meletios Pegas (1590-1601) and Kyrillos Loukaris (1601-1620). He succeeded Kyrillos on 30 Nov. 1620 when the latter was elected Patriarch of Constantinople.

Unlike his predecessor, however, Gerasimos was not friendly with Protestants whose proposals for closer ties he rejected. Gerasimos was well educated, preached often (his sermons were translated into Arabic) and was an active pastor. He served Alexandria until his death on 30 July 1631 and was succeeded by Metrophanes Kritopoulos. See Phoropoulos, *TEE*, IV, 330-32; Mazarakes, *Symvôle*, pp. 513-55; and N. Tomadakes, "Dyo Kretes Patriarchai Alexandreias sygcheomenoi," *Kretika Chronika*, III (1949), 179-203.

3. Patriarch Gerasimos Palladas was also born in Crete. He received his higher education in Rome at the College of St. Athanasios. Following his graduation, he taught for some time,

was ordained a clergyman, and then elected metropolitan of Kastoria. Later he became administrator of the metropolis of Adrianople. (There is a great deal of uncertainty with regard to both of these offices.) What is certain is that on 25 July 1688, he was elected Patriarch of Alexandria, succeeding Parthenios I (1678-1688). He served until 20 Jan. 1710, when he resigned. Gerasimos then retired to the monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos where he died in January 1714.

Patriarch Gerasimos was a prolific letter writer, corresponding widely with important persons both within and outside of the Ottoman Empire. He also authored a long list of impressive sounding works dealing with philosophy, literature, theology, hymnology, and rhetoric. At one point, he was accused of Latin sympathies with regard to the question of the eucharist but this was resolved amicably. See Tomadakes, *Kretika Chronika*, III (1949), 179-203; Mazarakes, *Symvole*, pp. 513-55; and Phoropoulos, *TEE*, IV, 336-38.

4. Inclusive dates: 1690-1705; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XII, 810; A. Mitsides (*TEE*, VII, 1126-38) does not list anyone between Hilarion 1674-1682 and Silvestros 1718-1733.

5. Attested from 1695-1704; See K. Chatzepsaltes, "Episkopoi Kitiou tou deuteroi hemiseos tou IZ aionos," *Kypriaka Grammata*, XIV (1949), 383.

62 (53)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

May 1700, Indiction 8

The stavropegion rank of the monastery of Evangelistria at "Kalamos tou Kalou Livadiou," in the diocese of Thebes, is confirmed.

Hieromonk Gregorios, the founder of the monastery and the person who petitions for the confirmation, presented a letter of Patriarch Hieremias I¹ who first granted the monastery stavropegion rank.

As a sign of its dependency, the monastery is to pay to the Patriarchate one half *kontarion* of honey annually.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

[†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Makarios of Anchialos, †Gregorios of Proilavos, †Athanasios of Thebes,² †Patriarchal Exarch Gerasimos of . . .]³

Monokondy lion

Text: Zakythinos, *Hellenika*, II (1929), 394-97. Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 613; Karapiperes, pp. 109-10; Aimilianos, p. 475.

1. Hieremias I succeeded Patriarch Theoleptos I (1513-1522) on 31 December 1522. Hieremias was from Ioannina and was metropolitan of Sophia when elected patriarch.

He was expelled from office by his enemies when he undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The patriarchal officials, taking advantage of his absence, decided to enforce a seldom used canon, number 16 of the Council of 861 held in Constantinople, which stated that any hierarch absent from his see for more than six months was deposed.

The beneficiary of this canon was Metropolitan Ioannikios of Sozopolis, an old adversary, who succeeded Hieremias in the autumn of 1524. Nevertheless, about six months after his return to Constantinople (autumn 1525), Hieremias succeeded in regaining the Patriarchate which he held until his death on 13 January 1546 in Vratza, Bulgaria. Patriarch Hieremias had been on a visit of Wallachia and Moldavia when he became ill on his way back to Constantinople. Prior to his death, he became, following an old tradition, a *megaloschemos* monk. See Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 74-76; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 500-07; C. Patrinoles, *TEE*, VI, 779-80; and the latter's excellent study, "Chronologika zetemata tes patriarcheias tou Hieremiou A' (1522-1546), *Mnemosyne*, I (1967), 249-62, which corrects the errors of both Gedeon and Germanos.

2. Inclusive dates: unknown. Konstantinides (*TEE*, VI, 516) cites no one between Hierotheos 1666-1687 and Damianos 1721.

3. The signatures are provided by Zakythenos (*Hellenika*, II (1929)), 394) who read the original. He records Gregorios of

Proikonesos for Gregorios of Proilavo which was rightly corrected by V. Laurent, *Diplômes patriarchaux*," *Hellenika*, III (1930), 202.

63 (54)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

July 1700, Indiction 8

The stavropegion rank of the monastery of the Theotokos Kosiniate (Kosinitza) with its dependencies: St. George Vranokastron, Panagia Heliokallou at Serres, and the villages of Posiano, Choremista, and Nikasgiane, is confirmed. The neighboring hierarchs are not to interfere in the affairs of the monastery, whose **hegoumenos** bears the title of protosynkelos and archimandrites. The fathers of the monastery are free to choose any hierarch they please when in need of an ordination.

The confirmation was based on letters issued by Patriarchs Maximos III¹ and Hieremias II.²

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Proilavo, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylon

Cited: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Ekthesis palaiographikon kai philologikon hereunon en Thrake kai Makedonia," *Hellenikos Philologikos Syllogos, Parartema*, XVII (1886), 16, Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 486, 613; Karapiperes, p. 110; Aimilianos, p. 475. The sigillia of Patriarchs Maximos and Hieremias in Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Hellenikos Philologikos Syllogos, Parartema*, XVII, 18-20 and 22-23.

1. Before becoming patriarch, Maximos served as Grand Eklesiarches of the Great Church under Patriarch Ioasaph I Kokkas

(Dec. 1465-1466). It was in this capacity that Manouel (his name before becoming patriarch) refused to issue a divorce to Proto-vestiarios George Amiroutzes who wished to marry the widow of Demetrios Asa, Duke of Athens. Despite pressures from the Ottoman Porte, where Amiroutzes had great influence, both Maximos and Patriarch Ioasaph refused and were consequently punished by order of Sultan Mehmed II. Patriarch Ioasaph was expelled, while Maximos suffered an old Byzantine penalty, his nose was mutilated.

Maximos became patriarch in 1476, following the ouster of Patriarch Raphael the Serb. He was well educated and is said to have known Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin in addition to classical Greek. Moreover, he acquired the reputation of holiness even among his contemporaries and was frequently found in the pulpit preaching.

Like Patriarch Gennadios II, he too was invited to submit a confession of faith by Sultan Bayazid. He died in office on about the beginning of 1482 and is numbered among the Orthodox saints. See Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, VIII, 626-27; Runciman, *Great Church*, pp. 193-95; *Historia Politica*, pp. 47-50; *Historia Patriarchica*, pp. 115-24; *Hypselantes*, p. 17.

2. Hieremias II was one of the greatest patriarchs ever to serve the Church of Constantinople. Born in Anchialos, Hieremias received a good education. He was Metropolitan of Larissa (1570-1572) when elected Patriarch of Constantinople on 5 May 1572 and served until 29 Nov. 1579. On the latter date, he was expelled by his predecessor Metrophanes III who succeeded in returning. Upon the latter's death, Hieremias returned for a second time (Aug. 1580-about Mar. 1584). Nevertheless, the partisans of Metrophanes persisted and led by Pachomios of Kaisaria, Hieremias was expelled once more and was exiled to the island of Rhodes. He returned for a third time in 1587 and remained in office until 1595, the year of his death.

Hieremias was first among Orthodox patriarchs to come in contact with leaders of the Reformation, entering into correspondence with such theologians of Tübingen as Martinus Crusius, Jacob Andrae, Stephen Gerlach, and others. He also exchanged letters with Pope Gregory XIII over the introduction of the new calendar. The latter was rejected by Hieremias as an innovation and because of its propaganda value to the Roman Church, while with the Protestant divines, he realized that the

gulf separating Protestant theology and Orthodoxy was too wide and counseled that each should go on its way in peace.

Hieremias was also responsible for establishing the Russian Patriarchate. He elevated Metropolitan Job of Moscow to patriarchal rank in 1589 while on a visit to Russia. This action was later officially confirmed in a synod held in Constantinople in 1593 with the participation of the other Orthodox Patriarchates, Karmires, TEE, VI, 780-84; idem, *Ta dogmatika kai symvolika menmeia*, I, 369-488; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 176-84, 212-16; Runciman, *Great Church*, pp. 247-56; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 518-23, 524-25, 531-36; Hypselantes, pp. 108-112; *Historia Patriarchica*, pp. 191-204; and Konstantinos Sathas, *Viographikon schediasma peri tou Patriarchou Hieremia B' 1572-1594* (Athens, 1870).

64 (55)

GRANT OF STAVROPEGION RANK

Patriarchikon synodikon gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

September 1700, Indiction 9

Archbishop Gerasimos of Melos & Kimolos¹ petitions for and is granted stavropegion rank for the "small monastery" of St. George, refounded by hegoumenos Athanasios on the island of Hagionesi.²

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople
Monokondylion

Cited: Aimilianos, p. 475.

1. In the MS: Sept. 1700-3 Feb. 1701; Nos. 64, 69. Inclusive dates: Sept. 1700-just before 3 Feb. 1701 when he is cited as dead and his successor Neophytos was elected. See No. 69 below.

2. Islands in the Aegean Sea.

65 (56)

GRANT OF STAVROPEGION RANK

Sigillion gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

January 1701, Indiction 9

The Church of the Theotokos, called Eoni, in the diocese of Reon, in the Peloponnesos, is granted **stavropegion** rank. The church lay in ruins and was completely restored by Ioannes, son of Stamates of the village of Prastos. He together with the elders and **proestotes**¹ of the village are to choose the priest who is to perform all the services in the church. The latter is to be free from all outside interference.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Neophytos of Philippoupolis

Monokondylion

-
1. The reference here is to lay leaders of the community.

66 (57)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchike kai synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

January 1701, Indiction 9

Patriarch Kallinikos and the Holy Synod rule that except for the Monastery of Nea Mone and its dependencies, and the patriarchal Exarchate of Pyrgion, Volissos, & Psarra, all other monasteries and churches in Chios are not of **stavropegion** rank but are diocesan

and subject to Metropolitan of Gennadios and his successors.

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion

Text: Ioannes Andreades, *Historia tes en Chio Orthodoxou Ekklesias* (Athens, 1940), I, cxix-cxxi; I. Phoropoulos, *EA*, XIX (1899), pp. 143-44. Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 614; Karapiperes, p. 110.

1. For the Exarchate, see Andreades, *Chios*, pp. 201-17.

67 (57b-58)

CONFIRMATION

**Patriarchikon kai synodikon epivevaioterion
gramma**

Patriarch Kallinikos II
January 1701, Indiction 9

The stavropegion rank of the Monastery of St. Anastasia Pharmakolatria,¹ founded by Mr. Theonas, later Metropolitan of Thessalonike,² at Megalo Vouno, in the diocese of Ardamerion & Galatista, in the metropolis of Thessalonike, is confirmed. This ruling also applies to the monastery's dependencies, including the metochion of Kyr Ioel, the church of St. Hypatia, and St. Panteleimon.

The confirmation is based upon letters issued by Patriarch Kyrillos I, the Elder,³ Parthenios I, the Elder,⁴ Hieremias I, the Elder,⁵ Ioasaph II,⁶ Matthaïos II,⁷ and confirmed by Patriarch Meletios⁸ and Sil-

vestros⁹ of Alexandria and Patriarch Theophanes III of Jerusalem.¹⁰

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 110; Aimilianos (p. 476) erroneously cites the sigillion as referring to the Monastery of Phaneromene.

1. The monastery was originally founded by Empress Theophano, wife of Leo the Wise (886-912). In the beginning of the sixteenth century it was in a semi-abandoned condition. This is why Theonas (Metropolitan of Thessalonike in 1539) is referred to as its new founder in 1525. See Kornarakes, *TEE*, II, 568-69.

2. Only attestation in 1539; *ibid*.

3. See above No. 1.

4. See above No. 1.

5. See above No. 62.

6. Called the Magnificent, Ioasaph II was an enlightened, well educated, and reverent man. He was born in Krapsi, Epiros and studied in Ioannina and Nauplion. He learned Persian, Arabic, and Turkish in addition to his Greek.

Ioasaph showed his concern for education immediately upon becoming Metropolitan of Adrianople (1535-1555) where he founded a school. When Ioasaph became patriarch of Constantinople in August 1555, succeeding Dionysios II, he brought Ioannes Zygomalas, an outstanding teacher, to Constantinople as head of the Patriarchal Academy which he supported with great enthusiasm.

Patriarch Ioasaph made great efforts to ameliorate the financial condition of the Patriarchate. He succeeded in reducing the debt in half and personally donated money for this purpose. But he also created enemies, among them the powerful merchant Michael Kantakouzenos and Metropolitan Metrophanes of Kaisaria. They found an opportunity during a synod convoked by Ioasaph in

1565 to charge him with simony. He was deposed on 8 January 1565.

Ioasaph retired to Mount Athos, the usual refuge of deposed patriarchs, and was succeeded by Metrophanes III of Kaisaria. Ioasaph, however, petitioned the synod to review his unjust deposition. This was done and he was found to have been innocent of any misconduct. This, however, did not mean his return. Instead, he left Mount Athos and returned to his old metropolis of Adrianople where he died. *Historia Patriarchica*, pp. 179-89; Meletios, *Historia*, p. 367; Hypselantes, pp. 96, 101; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 78-82; Runciman, *Great Church*, pp. 246-47.

7. Patriarch Matthaïos II was born in Klinovon, Thessaly and served as Metropolitan of Ioannina (1585-1595). According to Germanos (*Orthodoxia*, IX ((1934)), 255), he illegally seized the Patriarchal Throne while the hierarchy was waiting for Meletios Pegas to arrive from Alexandria to assume the administration of the Patriarchate. Consequently, Matthew was able to serve for only twenty days in February 1596 and then retired to Mount Athos.

When Pegas left Constantinople, Matthew was invited to return and served from April 1598-about December 1601. During this tenure of office, Matthew transferred the Patriarchate from St. Demetrios Kanaves at Xyloporta to its present site at the Phanar.

Patriarch Matthew also served for a third time for a few days between January and February 1603. Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 536-37, 541-42; Konstantinides, *TEE*, VIII, 834-35; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 255, 326-27, and X (1935), 359.

8. See above No. 1.

9. Patriarch and Pope Silvestros served the Church of Alexandria from 1566-1590. He was born on the island of Krete where he became a monk and later *hegoumenos* of the Monastery of Agkarathon.

As patriarch, Silvestros traveled considerably, making frequent trips to Constantinople, Greece, Jerusalem, and Mount Athos. During his absence, the Church of Alexandria was administered by his chancellor and later successor Meletios Pegas.

Silvestros died on 19 February 1590 while on a visit to Rhodes; G. Metallenos, *TEE*, XI, 149-50; Mazarakes, *Symvole*, pp. 102-29; Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Historia tes Ekklesias Alexandreias* (Alexandria, 1935), pp. 613-38.

10. Theophanes Karakallos was the third to serve the Church of Jerusalem bearing that name. He succeeded his uncle Sophronios in 1609 and remained in office until 1644.

Theophanes was born in Demetsana, Peloponnesos where he entered the Monastery of Philosophou. Later, his uncle invited him to Jerusalem where he became a Grand Archimandrites.

As patriarch, Theophanes concerned himself with the Holy Places which had come under the attack of the Latins in the beginning of the century. Aided by the French government and supported often by local Ottoman officials, Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans sought to displace the Orthodox from the sacred sites. In addition, Serbians and Armenians also competed with the Greeks over certain areas.

In this contest, the Greeks were not initially successful but retreated before the Latins. In fact, when Theophanes protested certain encroachments to the Ottoman governor, the pasha, suitably bribed, incarcerated him and sought to have him put to death. Theophanes escaped jail with the aid of bribes and disguised as a woman. He traveled to Constantinople where with the aid of Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris and of the Dutch embassy he was able to secure from the Sultan a favorable ruling.

Nevertheless, this ruling was ignored by the local authorities in Jerusalem who were beholden to the Latin missionaries and their supporters. When he protested, Theophanes was again jailed and later freed. He hurried to Constantinople to the Sultan's court where the battle over the Holy Places was fought. Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris imposed a special contribution on all Orthodox to secure money for this struggle. In 1633, Sultan Murad IV ruled in favor of the Orthodox and Patriarch Theophanes who recovered Bethlehem, the Church of the Resurrection and other sites.

Theophanes spent much of his time outside of Jerusalem, before and after this contest, to gather funds for the restoration of many of the Orthodox institutions in the Holy Land. On one of his trips to Russia, he installed Philaret, father of Tsar Michael Romanov, as Patriarch of Moscow. Theophanes died on 15 December 1644 in Constantinople. See Gritsopoulos, *Mone Philosophou*, pp. 249-64 and *idem.*, *TEE*, VI, 370-73.

68 (58b-59)

CONFIRMATION

**Patriarchikon synodikon epivevmiotikon
gramma**

**Patriarch Kallinikos II
January 1701, Indiction•9**

The stavropegion rank of the Monastery of the Panagia Phaneromene at Sogika and Klonian, in the province of Korinth, is confirmed. It had been previously confirmed by Patriarch Kyrillos I.

As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, the monastery is required to pay 30 aspers annually.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia,
†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Nikodemos of Derkos
Monokondy lion

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 110; Aimilianos, p. 476.

69 (59b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

**Patriarch Kallinikos II
3 February 1701, Indiction 9**

Archimandrites of the Great Church Neophytos is elected Archbishop of Melos & Kimolos¹ to succeed Gerasimos who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Dionysios and Hieromonk Hieremias

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia,
†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Ga-
briel of Chalkedon, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 3 Feb. 1701-?
2. See above No. 64.

70 (60)

PERMISSION TO MARRY

Synodike apophasis
Patriarch Kallinikos II
May 1701, Indiction 9

Addressed to the clergy, archons, and the faithful of
“our nation” (*genous*)¹ on the island of Tenos, declar-
ing that Modenas Perastinos has permission to marry
whomever he chooses.

Modenas had been ordained as a celibate clergyman
ten years previously. He had wanted to marry at that
time, but was “prevented” from doing so. Later he had
sexual relations with a woman and thereafter abstained
from all priestly functions.

Seeking the mercy of the Church, Modenas traveled
to Constantinople and related his story. There he found
compassion since “the Great Church is a hospital and
offers cures according to the nature of the illness.”

Monologema

Text: Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 82-83. Gedeon omits the first four
lines which identify the place and the addresses.

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 611; Karapiperes (pp. 106-07) omits
the month.

1. Reference to “our nation” probably due to the presence of
Greek (Roman) Catholics on the island of Tenos who were not
members of the Roman (Orthodox) nation.

71 (61)

DEPOSITION AND UNFROCKING

Synodike kathairesis
Patriarch Kallinikos II
[May] 1701, Indiction 9

Metropolitan Makarios of Selyvria¹ is deposed, "stripped of divine grace," eliminated from the ranks of hierarchs, and is to be known as Makarios the monk. Permission is given to the hierarchs to elect a successor.

Makarios was deposed and unfrocked because he was found guilty of conduct unbecoming an hierarch and a Christian. Moreover, he had misappropriated funds belonging to his metropolis and had encumbered it with unnecessary debts. He remained deaf to all advice and continued unchanged in his ways.

Monokondylon

1. In the MS: Nos. 71, 72, 73. Although cited here as deposed, Makarios submits his autograph resignation, dated 10 May 1701; see No. 72 below. Inclusive dates: ? - May 1701, unfrocked, resigned; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 119 and n. 6.

72 (62)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis
Patriarch Kallinikos II
10 May 1701, Indiction 9

Metropolitan Makarios of Selyvria resigns due to his inability to cope with his personal financial problems and those of his metropolis.

†Metropolitan Makarios, formerly of Selyvria.¹

1. See above No. 71.

73 (63)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

May 1701, Indiction 9

Hieromonk Leontios is elected Metropolitan of Selyvria¹ to succeed Makarios who resigned.²

Other candidates: Priest Laurentios and Priest Gabriel
†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia,
†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Anthimos of Ikonion, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene, †Gennadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Anthimos of Serres

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, May 1701-1724; Germanos, Thra-kika, VI, 119-20.

2. See above No. 71.

74 (64)

RESIGNATION

Paraitiesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

18 May 1701, Indiction 9

Metropolitan Gregorios of Sophia resigns due to his inability to administer his metropolis, to cope with its old and new indebtedness, and to collect the annual zetia, voetheia, and imperial charatsi.

Gregorios had made "a fervent appeal . . . with tears in his eyes," to be permitted to resign. Patriarch

“Kyrios, Kyrios, Kyr”¹ Kallinikos, finally accepted.

†the humble Metropolitan Gregorios, formerly of Sophia.²

1. The only example of the triple use of the word Kyrios or Kyr found in the MS when addressing the patriarch. A double use was and still is customary.

2. See above No. 54.

75 (64b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II
23 May 1701, Indiction 9

Hieromonk Anastasios is elected Metropolitan of Sophia¹ to succeed Gregorios who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Hieremias and Hieromonk Methodios

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Anthimos of Ikonion, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene, †Gannadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 23 May 1701-sometime before 1743 when his successor Anthimos (1743-12 Apr. 1754) was elected and he is cited as dead. See Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 168, n 5.

2. See above Nos. 54 and 74.

76 (72)

GRANT OF STAVROPEGION RANK

Patriarchikon stavropegion sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

June 1701, Indiction 9

The Monastery of St. George, near Mount Galisenos¹ in Trapezous (Trebizond) is granted stavropegion rank. As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, it is required to make an annual contribution of 3 okades of wax.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene, †Gennadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylon

Cited: Karapiperes, p. 110; Chrysanthos, Trapezous, p. 501; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Nachtrage zum Register der Urkunden," Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XIV (1905), 387.

1. The Monastery of St. George Peristeriota was founded in 732, destroyed by the Turks in 1203, and refounded in 1393. See Chrysanthos, Trapezous, pp. 500-02.

77 (65-66)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchikon gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

1701

Patriarch Kallinikos II informs Metropolitan [Athanasios] of Adrianople,¹ his officials, archons, and faithful

that Christians may not abandon their parishes and attend church in another. This kind of conduct is bad and illegal, producing sin and creating scandal which, according to St. Paul, is a very serious sin.

The practice of attending church in a parish other than one's own may appear innocent and harmless and be motivated out of friendship, nevertheless, it destroys ecclesiastical order which all Christians are obliged to obey even unto death. Disorder brings chaos.

Monokondyilion

Text: Gedeon (*Diataxeis*, I, 76-80) omits the greetings and addressees, although in a note he does inform us that the document was addressed to Adrianople. He copied his text from the *Codex of Kypriou*, pp. 567-71.

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 611; Karapiperes (p. 106) erroneously dates this 1700.

1. See above No. 24.

78 (66b-68)

PATRIARCHAL RULINGS

Patriarchikon gramma

2 August 1701, Indiction 9

Patriarch Kallinikos II answers various canonical questions and problems submitted to him by Metropolitan Athanasios of Christianoupolis.¹

Q. Should a man and a woman be married, in accordance with parental wishes, after the man had seized the woman and violated her, or should the pertinent ecclesiastical penalties be applied and the appropriate patriarchal curses be issued? In brief, should the Church's rule be strictly enforced?

A. Guard the rule of the Church. The man and woman are under the discipline of the Church until they separate. There are to be no exceptions.

Q. Two brothers seized two sisters and violated them. Later, the woman of one died; the other couple now seek marriage. Should they be?

A. No wedding. The crown of the Church is placed on those who have fought against the flesh and have guarded their virginity.

Q. A girl from the village of Kamara was seized while travelling and was forced into marriage. Later, her relatives freed her and she married another. Was this correct?

A. Yes. You did well.

Q. A priest from Lakedaimonia came to Christianoupolis and performed a wedding without permission. In opposition to this, they were ordered remarried. Was this right?

A. No. This must not be repeated. Remarrying "common folk" does not cause them any sorrow nor does it serve as a lesson to others. In fact, they rejoice and boast that they have received a double blessing. Even if the marriage were to be repeated thrice, they would count it as having been done once. The priest who performed the wedding should be unfrocked; the couple and those who consented to the wedding should be punished and anathematized. The Church prohibits the repetition of sacraments, as in baptism and ordination. This holds true for marriage as well. Be careful that this is never repeated.

Q. Theodoros and his wife accidentally suffocated their child while it slept with them. He seeks ordination. Should he be accepted?

A. No. Although accidental murder is not punished as murder, a priest cannot be guilty even of this.

Q. Theodorakes, whose wife also killed her child accidentally in her sleep, seeks ordination. Should he be accepted?

A. No. "There is no need for those accused and blamed in any way to receive the priesthood, or are there no other priests to perform the services of the sacraments?"

Q. Is Stamatelos the priest, whose wife fell asleep

while nursing her unbaptized child and crushed it, responsible in any way?

A. Suspend him for a time. When the incident has been forgotten, forgive him.

Q. John the priest gave his son a lighted torch with which he fatally burned himself. Is he responsible?

A. Yes. He is unforgiven. Suspend him.

Q. Some men seize women and go to another province and marry them. Then they return here. What should be done about them?

A. The marriage stands but they are anathematized, and the priest is unfrocked.

Finally, Metropolitan Athanasios is informed that his request for a letter of absolution is granted and is enclosed. He is commended by the Patriarch for his zeal in administering his province in accordance with the will of the Church and for setting a good example for others by performing his duty.

Metropolitan Athanasios is also told to advise the elders and his fellow hierarchs, for many irregularities had been reported. All should think hard upon what they do, especially with what authority they perform ordinations in places where they lack jurisdiction. They are to seek permission for ordinations from the proper authority, for does a metropolitan ordain a metropolitan, or does the patriarch give permission for him to be ordained? Even in Venice, which is a "Frankish state" and in Kephallenia, they do not ordain anyone unless they first secure permission from the Patriarchate. So where do they [in the Peloponnesos] receive permission to ordain? Do they not know that in such acts they mock what is holy and "perform comedies?" Those who perform such ordinations and those who received them are unfrocked. Tell them to cease!

Monokondylion

Text: Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 83-87. Resume: Gritsopoulos, *Mone Philosophou*, pp. 413-14, note; Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 611; Karapiperes, p. 107.

1. One of the saints of the Orthodox Church, commemorated on 17 May, Metropolitan Athanasios' election date is not precisely known. According to Gritsopoulos, his election took place sometime between 1673 and 1681. Athanasios remained in office perhaps until 1710. His canonization was never officially enacted but derived from the piety and respect of his flock and their descendants. See Gritsopoulos, *Mone Philosophou*, pp. 410-17; *idem.*, *TEE*, I, 555-56; Vapori, *Aspects*, pp. 53-55.

79 (68b-69)

GRANT OF STAVROPEGION RANK

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes
gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II
August 1701, Indiction 9

The Monastery of the Ascension at Palaiokastron, in the province of Old Patras, is granted *stavropegion* rank. As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, it is required to contribute one gold florin annually.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia,
†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene, †Gennadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos
Monokondylion

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 110; Aimilianos, p. 476.

80 (70)

DEPOSITION AND UNFROCKING

Synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

[September-December] 1701, Indiction 10¹

Metropolitan Gregorios of Philippi & Drama² is deposed for various crimes, among them extortion of money under the guise of collecting money for the zetia. In addition, he abandoned his see for two years, contrary to the canon which prohibits this for more than six months.³ He is, therefore, also unfrocked and removed from the lists of hierarchs. He is to be known as "Evil-Gregorios the monk."

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Genadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion. Menologema

1. Months based on Indiction.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, Oct. 1692-Sept./Dec. 1701, Deposed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, I, 442. P. Papaevangelos (TEE, XI, 104-09) only lists Gregorios in 1692, followed by Anthimos in 1715. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XIV, 785) records 1692-700.

3. See above No. 18.

81 (73b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

16 December 1701, Indiction 10

Hieromonk Kallinikos is elected Metropolitan of Sozopolis¹ to succeed Gerasimos who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Laurentios and Hieromonk Damaskenos

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Genadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 16 Dec. 1701-sometime before June 1722 when another hierarch, Ioasaph, is cited. Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 171-72.

2. Inclusive dates: ? - about 16 Dec. 1701 when cited as having resigned. See Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 171-72.

82 (74)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II
1 March 1702, Indiction 10

Hieromonk Euthymios is elected Archbishop of Pogoniane¹ to succeed Malachias who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Nikephoros and Hieromonk Gabriel

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 347; I, 350, 351; Germanos, *ECH*, XII, 93-94; Karapiperes (p. 110) was unable to ascribe a date to the document.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 1 Mar. 1702-1721; Germanos, *EC*, XII, 93-94.

2. Inclusive dates: ? - c. 1 Mar. 1702 when cited as dead.

83 (74b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

15 March 1702, Indiction 10

Protosynkelos of the Great Church Theokletos is elected Archbishop of Proikonesos¹ to succeed Metrophanes who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Laurentios and Hieromonk Gabriel

†Kyprianos of Kaisaria, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Athenagoras, EEBS, IX (1932), 261.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 15 Mar. 1702-1731; Gritsopoulos (TEE, X, 613) does not know of Theokletos' election. He lists Metrophanes from 1677-1698 and Theokletos from 1718-1731.

2. See above No. 47.

84 (71)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

7 August 1702, Indiction 10

The Protosynkelos of the Great Church Hieromonk Symeon is elected Metropolitan of Xanthe & Peritheorion¹ to succeed Damaskenos who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Ioasaph and Hieromonk Markos

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Par-

thenios of Nikomedea, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Athens,³ †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Anthimos of Serres, †Kyprianos of Smyrna, †Kallinikos of Maronia, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Athenagoras, **EEBS**, IX (1932), 262.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 7 Aug. 1702-c. 1708 when Makarios is cited; Germanos, **Thrakika**, VI, 108, but cf. Gritsopoulos, **TEE**, IX, 648.

2. Inclusive dates: 1671-c. 7 Aug. 1702 when he is cited as dead; Germanos, **Thrakika**, VI, 108. Gritsopoulos, **TEE**, IX, 648.

3. In the MS: 7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 84, 85. Inclusive dates: 1699-1703; Janin, **Dictionnaire**, V, 40-41, Soteriou (**TEE**, I, 667-78) cites Kyrillos only in 1693 and this, according to him, is a probable date. Kyrillos was elected Metropolitan of Paronaxia in 1703 and served until 1722. See Sphyroeras, **TEE**, X, 89.

85 (71b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

7 August 1702, Indiction 10

Ephemerios of the Great Church Dionysios the Hieromonk is elected Metropolitan of Amasia¹ to succeed Ioannikios who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Kyrillos and Hieromonk Damianos

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedea, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Athens, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Anthimos of Serres, †Kyprianos of Smyrna, †Kallinikos of Maronia, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. In the MS: 7 Aug. 1702-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 85, 87. Inclusive

dates: Elected, 7 Aug. 1702-1724. Gritsopoulos (TEE, II, 265) erroneously lists Dionysios from 1717-1720, while Vailhé (Dictionnaire, II, 970) finds Dionysios cited in 1717 and 1724.

2. See above No. 15.

86 (75)

ENDOWMENT

Synodikon sigilliodes grammata

Patriarch Hieremias III

August 1718, Indiction 11

The patriarchal stavropegion church of St. Nicholas of Myra in Lykia, the Wonderworker, called Tzernika (Cernica) at Graniste(Grădiste), near the river Kolentinas (Colentina) in Houn grovlachia (Wallachia), together with its properties is made a metochion (endowment) of the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

This action is taken because, according to Patriarch of Myra and Pope Samouel I of Alexandria,¹ Voevode Ioannes (John) Constantin Basaraba,² with the consent of the archons of Wallachia, made a gift of the monastery of the Theotokos of the Zlatarides in Bucarest to the Patriarchate of Alexandria in the time of Patriarch Gerasimos I.³ Basaraba, however, did not live long enough to make provisions for its maintenance. Therefore, in order to establish the monastery on a solid foundation and to prevent its ruin, Patriarch Samouel asked for the above stavropegion church of St. Nicholas. (The latter had been given to the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the time of Patriarch Timotheos II⁴ in 7125 [1617] "in the name of philanthropia.")

The need for the church of St. Nicholas was made more imperative since the Monastery of Sigartsa (Segarcea), near the Olto (Olt) had been destroyed. It was this monastery which provided assistance for the maintenance of the Monastery of the Zlatarides, the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and its two metochia in Wallachia.

†Patriarch Hieremias of Constantinople⁵

†Kallinikos of Heraklia & Raidesto,⁶ †Auxentios of Kyzikos,⁷ †Paisios of Nikomedia,⁸ †Konstantios of Chalkedon,⁹ †Ignatios of Thessalonike,¹⁰ †Parthenios of Larissa, †Hierotheos of Drystra,¹¹ Ignatios of Rhodes,¹² †Nikodemos of Mitylene,¹³ Ioakeim of Vizya,¹⁴ †Parthenios of Gothia & Kapha.¹⁵

Text: N. Iorga: *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor*, XIV, 840.

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 624; Aimilianos, p. 75.

1. Patriarch Samouel served the Church of Alexandria twice as patriarch: 1710-1712 and 1714-1723.

Born in Chios in 1661, Samouel came under the guardianship of Metropolitan Gregorios of Chios and later became a protege of Patriarch Parthenios of Jerusalem. The latter ordained him deacon and priest and made him his assistant.

Nevertheless, from 1693-1697, Samouel served the Patriarchate of Constantinople as protosynkelos. He then returned to Egypt where he was consecrated Metropolitan of Libya by Patriarch Gerasimos II whom Samouel succeeded in January 1710. The election, however, was contested in Constantinople where Kosmas, formerly Archbishop of Mount Sinai was elected instead. In the end, Samouel prevailed.

As patriarch, Samouel sought aid from Peter the Great and Queen Anne of England and participated in the correspondence between the Orthodox patriarchs and the English Nonjurors. He also corresponded with the Papacy to which he submitted a confession of faith and received a pallium from Pope Clement XI. This action apparently was conducted in secret from his fellow Orthodox and appears to be related with the controversy surrounding his election. Nevertheless, nothing came from his submission to Rome, for he soon broke off all relations. He died in September 1723. G. Metallenos, *TEE*, X, 1144-45; Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Historia tes Ekklesias Alexandreias* (Alexandria, 1935, pp. 715-49; Mazarakes, *Symvole*, pp. 556-82.

2. Matthew Basarab, 1632-1654.

3. See above No. 61.

4. See above No. 46.

5. Hieremias, a native of the island of Patmos, was Metropolitan

of Kaisaria (1707-Mar. 1716) when he was elected Patriarch of Constantinople on 23/25 March 1716. He had a rather turbulent term of office and was expelled on 20 November 1726 through the influence of his enemy, Voevode Gregorios Ghikas of Moldavia.

As patriarch, Hieremias confirmed Peter the Great's decision to abolish the Russian Patriarchate and replace it with a permanent synod. He condemned Papal errors in 1722 and issued a reply to the clergy of Great Britain on the question of the Eucharist.

Throughout his term of office, Hieremias found himself in severe financial straits and was reduced to a staff of four clergymen. On 15 September 1732, Hieremias returned for a second time but did not even complete a year in office, being expelled in March 1733. He was exiled to Mount Athos where he entered the Monastery of Laura. He remained there until his death in 1736. Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, XI (1936), 40-45; 54-60. Alexoudes, *Leukoma*, p. 108, but cf. Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XII, 202 on the chronology. Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 622-27; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, VI, 785-86.

6. Inclusive dates: Aug. (Oct.) 1718-19 Nov. 1726 (became patriarch?) died. Kallinikos was Metropolitan of Philippoupolis (1711-Aug., Oct. 1718) when elected to Heraklia. He had succeeded Gennadios (1714-1718) who died. Eustratiades believes that Kallinikos' election as patriarch, an election said to have been held in his own house on 19 Nov. 1726 with the participation of Gregoraskos Ghikas, Voevode of Wallachia, is a myth; see his "Metropolitai tes Thrakes," *Thrakika*, VI (1935), 12-14. The information furnished by Hypselantes (p. 324) in support of the election is not dismissed by Germanos in *Thrakika*, VI, 76 but is in *Orthodoxia*, XI (1936), 55-56. Eustratiades also dismisses Kallinikos as an hierarch who contributed nothing substantially but wasted his time in Phanariot politics. Germanos (*Thrakika*, VI, 76) lists Kallinikos' election to Heraklia in October, but the document is clearly dated August and the signatures were written very clearly by one hand. It is possible, of course, that the scribe erred when copying the document. Eulogios Kourilas, "Viographikos katalogos metropoliton Herakleias," *Thrakika*, XXVIII (1958), 96, also supports the October date.

7. In the MS: Aug. 1718-Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: 1712-1724; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIII, 1195.

8. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive

dates: Aug. 1718-20 Nov. 1726, elected Patriarch of Constantinople; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, XI (1936), 60-62; Konstantinides (TEE, IX, 543) erroneously lists Paisios from 1721-1726.

Paisios II served as patriarch four times: 20 Nov. 1726-mid Sept. 1732, Aug. 1740-the end of May 1743, Mar. 1744-28 Sept. 1748, and May/June 1751-beginning Sept. 1752; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, XI (1936), 60-62; Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 97.

9. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: Aug. 1702-1720; V. Stavrides, TEE, XII, 53-54; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIII, 276; Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 87.

10. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: Aug. 1718-1723. Tzogas (TEE, VI, 461) only cites Ignatios in 1723.

11. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: 1710-1719, died. Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 139; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 827.

12. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: 1702-1722; Konstantinides, TEE, X, 820.

13. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: 1712-Mar. 1719; Konstantinides (TEE, IX, 272) erroneously records 1712-1713. The signatures in the above document were written by one hand and are very clear.

14. In the MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 86, 87. Inclusive dates: 1708-1719; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 55, n 8; Janin (*Dictionnaire*, IX, 46) lists Ioakeim "c. 1715."

15. Inclusive dates unknown. He is unknown to Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XI, 158.

87 (76)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Hieremias III

28 March 1719, Indiction 12

Archbishop Kosmas, formerly of Siphnos,¹ is elected Metropolitan of Pisidia² to succeed Leontios who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Iakovos and Hieromonk Gregorios

†Paisios of Nikomedia, who also signs for Auxentios of Kyzikos and Konstantios of Chalkedon, †Gerasimos of Nikaia,⁴ who also signs for Ignatios of Thessalonike and Ignatios of Rhodes, †Dionysios of Amasia, †Makar-ios of Verroia,⁵ †Parthenios of Larissa, †Neophytos of . . . , †Nikodemos of Mitylene, †Hierotheos of Drystra, †Ioakeim of Vizya, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Grego-rios of . . . , Gregorios of Ganos & Chora,⁶ . . . of . . .

Cited: Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 239. He reads Thomas instead of Kosmas.

1. Inclusive dates: unknown.
2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 28 Mar. 1719 - ?; *ibid*.
3. See above No. 18.
4. Inclusive dates: 1717-1728; Konstantinides, *TEE*, IX, 459.
5. Inclusive dates: 1715-1721; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, III, 826; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, VIII, 887.
6. Inclusive dates: 1716-1728; Patrineles (*TEE*, IV, 231) is not certain whether the name should read Gregorios or Germanos. From the document, it appears to be Gregorios. See, too, Germanos (*Thrakika*, VI, 59), who reads Gregorios also.

88 (A)

PATRIARCHAL EXHORTATION

Patriarchikon gramma
Patriarch Ioannikios III
July 1761, Indiction 9

Patriarch Ioannikios III¹ addresses the officials, clergy, hierarchs, archons, and "beloved Christians" of the metropolis of Chalkedon, informing them that Metropolitan Ioannikios,² who had been transferred to their metropolis, was in financial distress. They are

urged to come to his aid and to give him every assistance. Clergy and hieromonks who have churches are to pay to him the *emvatikion*³ as is customary. Those who do not are to be suspended.

Menologema

1. Elected, 26 March 1761-21 May 1763; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, XI (1936), 242-47. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 102 for a brief biography of Ioannikios III.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, Mar. 1761-Jan. 1770; V. Stavrides, *TEE*, XII, 54; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XII, 276. Ioannikios had previously served as Metropolitan of Serres (1745-1761); cf. G. Stogolou, *TEE*, XI, 1117.

As Metropolitan of Serres, Ioannikios, together with Paisios of Kaisaria, Vartholomaïos of Drystra, and Ioannikios of Chalkedon, was one of those responsible for the expulsion of Patriarch Serapheim II (22 July 1757-16 March 1761). Ioannikios was especially displeased with Serapheim because the latter would not transfer him to the metropolis of Heraklia.

Originally, their choice was to be the former Patriarch Kyrillos V who was in exile on Mount Athos. The Grand Vizier, however, rejected this choice—because of Kyrillos' absence—and when Parthenios of Kaisaria, who held the first rank among the metropolitans, kissed the hand of Ioannikios II of Chalkedon, indicating his preference, the others joined and Ioannikios was chosen patriarch. On the same day, Ioannikios of Serres became Metropolitan of Chalkedon.

Ioannikios, however encountered immediate financial difficulties in his new see. He owed 15 loads to the new patriarch for the exchange of sees and another 50 loads were levied against him as *cereme* (fines or penalties). This explains in part the above document as well as the one that follows. See *Hypselantes*, pp. 387-88.

3. Fee paid to the bishop by clergy. This tax was introduced under Patriarch Hieremias I (1522-1524, 1524-1545). According to V. K. Stephanides ("To chreos tou Koinou kai he oikonomike epitrope tou Oikoumenikou Patriarcheïou," *NP*, I ((1919)), 221-22) the *emvatikia* were abolished by Patriarch Hieremias II (1672-1679) and were introduced by Patriarch Raphael II (1603-1607). Stephanides' study, *ibid.*, pp. 209-26, 289-306, is still the best

general survey on the various fees and taxes collected by the Patriarchate during the Ottoman period.

89 (B)

PATRIARCHAL EXHORTATION

Patriarchikon gramma

Patriarch Ioannikios III

July 1761, Indiction 9

Patriarch Ioannikios III addresses the officials, clergy, hieromonks, archons, and “beloved Christians” of the metropolis of Chalkedon, reminding them that it is customary for all new hierarchs who receive the imperial berat and “ecclesiastical letters” of appointment to receive from the clergy and laymen of their province the **philotimon**¹ in addition to the usual ecclesiastical income. They are, therefore, all paternally exhorted, admonished, and advised to pay it and to assist Metropolitan Ioannikios to pay his debts and to meet his expenses.

Menologema

1. Originally, a tax paid to the new patriarch by each hierarch and to the metropolitan by each of his bishops during his first year of office. Later, bishops were required to pay a **philotimon** tax to the general treasury of the Patriarchate as well. The tax was also extended to clergymen and laymen, payable to their hierarch. See Stephanides, NP, I (1919), pp. 222-25. Stephanides, however, does not mention the **philotimon** as a tax paid by laymen and priests.

INDEX TO THE REGESTA

A

- Ablianos, place of — 48
 Absolution, letter of — 35
 Achrida (Ohrid), Archbishopric of — 24
 Achrida, former archbishop of — 24
 Adrianople, city of — 24
 Adrianople, metropolitan of — 24
 Aegean Sea (White Sea), archbishops of — 32, 37
 Agathoupolis, diocese of — 47
 Alexander, Grand Chartophylax — 1
 Alexandria, patriarchate of — 24
 Alexandria, patriarchs of — 1, 61, 67
 Alexios Komnenos, emperor — 43
 Amasia, metropolitans of — 14, 15, 85
 Amosgos, monastery of — 61
 Amykla, bishop of — 10
 Anastasios, hieromonk — 75
 Anastasios, Kapikechagias — 1
 Anastasios, metropolitan of Sophia — 75
 Andronikos I Komnenos — 43
 Andronikos II Palaiologos — 33
 Andronikos III Palaiologos — 33
 Andros, archbishop of — 40
 Anchialos, metropolitans of — 24, 60
 Angelos Doukas, emperor — 44
 Ankyra, metropolitan of — 30
 Anthimos, hieromonk — 79
 Anthimos, metropolitan of Ikonion — 42
 Anthimos, metropolitan of Serres — 33
 Antioch, patriarchate of — 24
 Archimandrites — 2, 28, 63
 Archimandrites, of the Great Church — 69
 Archons — 1, 24, 37, 47, 51, 52, 77, 88, 89
 Ardamerion & Galatista, diocese of — 67
 Aristarchos — 1
 Arsenios, bishop of Kydonia — 47
 Ascension, monastery of — 79
 Aspers (aspra) — 41, 55, 68
 Astos, village of — 53
 Athanasios, hegoumenos — 64
 Athanasios, metropolitan of Adrianople — 24
 Athanasios, metropolitan of Christianoupolis — 78
 Athanasios, metropolitan of Drystra — 1
 Athanasios, metropolitan of Thebes — 62
 Athens, metropolitan of — 84
 Auxentios, metropolitan of Kyzikos — 86

B

Batzkovo, monastery of the
Theotokos of — 48
Bogasintzes, Manouel — 31
Bucarest, city of — 86

C

Chalkedon, metropolitans of
— 1, 86, 88
Charatsi (Kharadj) — 21, 41,
74
Chartophylax, Grand — 1
Chios, metropolitans of — 1,
11, 12
Choremista, village of — 63
Chourmouzes, Logothetes — 1
Chourmouzes, Protovestiaros
— 42
Christianoupolis, city of — 78
Christianoupolis, metropolitan
of — 78
Christianoupolis, metropolis of
— 78
Christophoros, hieromonk — 5
Chrysouvoula — 33
Civil authority — 8, 25
Chrysogonos — 42
Cyprus, archbishop of — 61
Cyprus, archdiocese of — 24

D

Damari, place of — 6
Damaskenos, hieromonk — 81
Damaskenos, metropolitan of
Xanthe & Peritheorion
— 84
Damianos, hieromonk — 81,
85
Daniel, metropolitan of An-
chialos — 24
Daniel, metropolitan of Mity-
lene — 7

Davaci — 50

Derkos, metropolitans of — 2,
42
Diamantes, of Paraskevas — 1
Didymoteichon, metropolitan
of — 24
Dikaiophylax — 1, 38, 45, 51
Dikaiophylax Chourmouzes —
45, 51
Dikaiophylax Spantones — 1,
38
Dionysios, ephemerios of the
Great Church — 85
Dionysios, hieromonk — 23,
27, 28, 69
Dionysios, metropolitan — 87
Dionysios, metropolitan of
Amasia — 85
Dionysios IV, patriarch of
Constantinople — 42
Demetrios, hieromonk — 26
Domikou, place of — 46
Dositheos II, patriarch of Jeru-
salem — 1, 24, 35
Drystra, metropolitans of — 1,
55, 86

E

Ecumenical Patriarchate — 24,
41
Ecumenical Throne — 1, 37,
41
Ekklesiarches, Grand — 1
Elasson & Domenikon, arch-
bishops of — 18, 19, 41
Emvatikion — 88
Ephemerios — 49, 57
Ephemerios, of the Great
Church — 85
Ephesos, metropolitan of — 1
Etesion — 44

Evangelistria, monastery of
 (Thebes) — 62
 Eucharist — 1
 Eupragiotes, Drakos — 1
 Euripos, metropolitan of — 46
 Eustathios, hierodeacon of the
 Great Church — 59
 Eustathios, metropolitan of
 Thessalonike — 59
 Euthymios, archbishop of Po-
 goniane — 82
 Euthymios, hieromonk — 82
 Exarchate, of Kerasous — 42
 Exarchate, of Pyrgion, Volis-
 sos, and Psirrai — 66
 Exarchate, patriarchal — 38,
 41

F

Florins — 3
 Frankish state — 78

G

Gabriel, hieromonk — 82, 83
 Gabriel, metropolitan of Chal-
 kedon — 1
 Gabriel, metropolitan of Phil-
 adelphia — 1
 Gabriel, the priest — 73
 Galaktion, hieromonk — 27
 Galaktion, metropolitan of
 Lemnos — 27
 Galasinos, mountain of — 76
 Ganos & Chora, metropolitans
 of — 2, 87
 Gedeon, archbishop of Samos
 — 6, 54
 Gedeon, archbishop of San-
 torine — 28
 Gennadios, hieromonk — 12
 Gennadios, metropolitan of
 Chios — 12
 Gennadios, metropolitan of
 Drystra — 7

Gennadios, metropolitan of
 Nikaia — 7
 Gennadios II, patriarch of
 Constantinople — 1
 Genous (Nation) — 70
 George, Grand Oikonomos — 1
 Gerasimos, archbishop of Me-
 los & Kimelos — 64, 69
 Gerasimos, hieromonk — 40
 Gerasimos, metropolitan of Ni-
 kaia — 87
 Gerasimos, metropolitan of
 Sozopolis — 81
 Gerasimos I, patriarch of Alex-
 andria — 61
 Gerasimos II, patriarch of
 Alexandria — 61
 Germanos, archbishop of Cy-
 prus — 61
 Germanos, hieromonk — 15,
 16, 40, 83
 Gerontes — 46
 Gothia, metropolitans of — 27,
 86
 Graniste, place of — 86
 Great Church — 18, 31, 70
 Great Church of Christ — 21,
 29, 47
 Gregorios, archbishop of An-
 dros — 40
 Gregorios, bishop, formerly of
 Klaudioupolis — 40
 Gregorios, hieromonk — 20,
 40, 62, 87
 Gregorios, metropolitan of —
 87
 Gregorios, metropolitan of
 Chios — 1
 Gregorios, metropolitan of
 Ganos & Chora — 87
 Gregorios, metropolitan of
 Naupaktos & Arta — 26
 Gregorios, metropolitan of
 Neokaisaria & Ineon — 20

Gregorios, metropolitan of
Philippi & Drama — 80
Gregorios, metropolitan of
Prespa — 39
Gregorios, metropolitan of
Proilavo (Braila) — 61
Gregorios, metropolitan of
Smyrna — 26
Gregorios, metropolitan of
Sophia — 54
Grosia — 25, 31, 38, 42, 45,
51

H

Hagia Mone, monastery of
(Paros) — 44
Hagia Zone, monastery of
(Samos) — 6
Hagiasma — 42, 45
Hagionesi, island of — 64
Hegoumene — 57
Hegoumenos — 6, 29, 34, 46,
54, 57, 63, 64
Heraklia, metropolitan of — 2
Heraklia & Radiasto, metro-
politan of — 86
Hierarch(s) — 1 and **passim**
Hieremias, hieromonk — 5
Hieremias, metropolitan of Di-
dymoteichon — 24
Hieremias I, patriarch of Con-
stantinople — 62, 67
Hieremias II, patriarch of Con-
stantinople — 63
Hieremias III, patriarch of
Constantinople — 86
Hierodeacon of the Great
Church — 59
Hieromonks — **passim**
Hierotheos, metropolitan of
Drystra — 86
Holy Apostles — 1
Holy and Catholic Church of
Christ — 1

Holy Cross, monastery of
(Naxos) — 44
Holy Liturgy — 41
Holy Synod — 1 and **passim**
Houngrovlachia — 86
Hypapante, chapel of — 46
Hypomnematographos, Man-
ouel — 51

I

Iakovos, hieromonk — 87
Iakovos, hieromonk and pneu-
matikos — 5
Iakovos, metropolitan of Neo-
kaisaria & Ineon — 5, 17
Iakovos, patriarch of Constan-
tinople — 42
Ignatios, hieromonk — 9
Ignatios, metropolitan of Neo-
kaisaria & Ineon — 5
Ignatios, metropolitan of
Rhodes — 86
Ignatios, metropolitan of Thes-
salonike — 9
Ignatios, metropolitan of Thes-
salonike — 86
Ikonion, metropolitans of —
40, 42
Ioakeim, metropolitan of An-
kyra — 30
Ioakeim, metropolitan of Viz-
ya — 86
Ioakeim, metropolitan of Zych-
na — 33
Ioannes (John) Constantin,
Voevode — 35
Ioannes (John) Constantin Ba-
saraba — 86
Ioannes (John), Grand Logo-
thetes — 1
Ioannes Stages, hieromonk —
37
Ioannes, of Stamates — 65

Ioannikios, bishop of Nemesos & Kytaia — 6
 Ioannikios, hieromonk — 15
 Ioannikios, metropolitan of Amasia — 15
 Ioannikios, metropolitan of Chalkedon — 88
 Ioannikios, metropolitan of Nikaia — 6
 Ioannikios III, patriarch of Constantinople — 88, 89
 Ioannina, metropolitan of — 21
 Ioasaph, hieromonk — 84
 Ioasaph, metropolitan of Amasia — 14
 Ioasaph, metropolitan of Paronaxia — 4
 Ioasaph, metropolitan of Verroia — 3
 Ioasaph II, patriarch of Constantinople — 67
 Ipekion (Pec), archbishopric of — 24
 Ioel, metochion of — 67
 Isaia I, patriarch of Constantinople — 33

J

Jerusalem, patriarchate of — 24
 Jerusalem, patriarchs of — 1, 24, 35, 67
 Jews — 8

K

Kaisaria, metropolitan of — 1
 Kallinikos, hieromonk — 81
 Kallinikos, metropolitan of Euripos — 46
 Kallinikos, metropolitan of Heraklia & Raidesto — 86
 Kallinikos, metropolitan of Krete — 21

Kallinikos, metropolitan of Maronia — 24
 Kallinikos, metropolitan of Sozopolis — 81
 Kallinikos II, patriarch of Constantinople — 1 and *passim*
 Kalonitza, monastery of (Naxos) — 44
 Kamara, village of — 78
 Kanokikon — 47, 57
 Kapenion marriage — 50
 Kapikechagias — 1
 Karpathos, archbishop of — 8
 Kavasilas, of Ioannes — 51
 Kephallenia, island of — 54
 Keramakes, Theodorakes — 1
 Kerasous, exarchate of — 38
 Kharadj, see Charatsi
 Klaudioupolis, metropolitans of — 4, 40
 Klemes, metropolitan of Ioannina — 21
 Kolentinas river — 86
 Konstantios, metropolitan of Chalkedon — 86
 Konstantios, metropolitan of Ganos & Chora — 2
 Konstantios, metropolitan of Rhodes — 2
 Konstantios, protosynkelos of the Great Church — 2
 Kontarion — 62
 Koralon, village of — 38
 Koresios, George — 1
 Kosmas, archbishop of Siphnos — 87
 Kosmas, false bishop of Polyphengos — 32
 Kosmas, hieromonk — 32
 Kosmas, metropolitan of Pisia — 87
 Konstantis, the priest — 1
 Krales, of Serbia — 33

Krete, metropolitan of — 21
 Kydonia, diocese of — 47
 Kyrellian Chapters — 1
 Kyrillos, hieromonk — 56, 85
 Kyrillos, hieromonk and protosynkellos — 30
 Kyrillos, metropolitan of Athens — 84
 Kyrillos, metropolitan of Krete — 21
 Kyrillos, metropolitan of Kyzikos — 1
 Kyrillos, metropolitan of Prousa — 7
 Kyrillos I, patriarch of Constantinople — 1, 67, 68
 Kyrillos, the priest — 2
 Kyprianos, metropolitan of Kaisaria — 1
 Kythera, metropolitan of — 1
 Kyzikos, metropolitans of — 1, 75

L

Lakedaimonia, hierarch of — 1
 Lakedaimonia, metropolis of — 78
 Larissa, metropolitan of — 8
 Latins — 1
 Laurentios, hieromonk (s) — 9, 30, 31, 36, 73, 81, 83
 Laurentios, the priest (s) — 7, 73
 Lemnos, metropolitans of — 27
 Leontios, hieromonk — 19, 22, 73
 Leontios, metropolitan of Pisia — 18
 Leontios, metropolitan of Selvyria — 73
 Logothetes — 1
 Logothetes, Grand — 1
 Loidorekion, diocese of — 43

M

Makarios, archimandrites — 2
 Makarios, hieromonk (s) — 13, 15, 16, 30, 36, 40
 Makarios, formerly archbishop of Klaudioupolis — 4
 Makarios, formerly metropolitan of Amykla — 10
 Makarios, metropolitan of Anchialos — 60
 Makarios, metropolitan of Derkos & Neochorion — 42
 Makarios, metropolitan of Lemnos — 36
 Makarios, metropolitan of Metra & Athyra — 22, 59, 60
 Makarios, metropolitan of Naupaktos & Arta — 22, 23, 59
 Makarios, metropolitan of Paronaxia — 4
 Makarios, metropolitan of Selvyria — 71
 Makarios, metropolitan of Tzia & Thermia — 10, 1
 Makarios, proedros of Verroia — 31
 Malachias, metropolitan of Pogoniane — 82
 Malikâne — 24
 Manolakes, the furrier — 51
 Manolakes, Grand Skevophylax — 51
 Manouel I Porphyrogennetos, emperor — 43
 Manouel, Rhetor — 1
 Markos, hieromonk — 84
 Maronia, metropolitan of — 24
 Matthaïos II, patriarch of Constantinople — 67
 Maximos Margounios, metropolitan of Kythera — 1

Maximos III, patriarch of Constantinople — 63
 Megalo Vouno, place of — 67
 Melenikon (Melnik), former metropolitan of — 36
 Meletios, hieromonk — 6
 Meletios, metropolitan of Naupaktos & Arta — 21
 Meletios Pegas, patriarch of Alexandria — 1, 67
 Melos & Kimelos, archbishop of — 64
 Menoikys, mountain of — 35
 Menologema — 8, 18, 21
 Metavole — 1
 Methodios, hieromonk — 75
 Metochion — 48, 67, 86
 Metousiosis (transubstantiation) — 1
 Metra & Athyra, archbishops of — 22, 23, 59, 60
 Metrophanes, metropolitan of Melenikon — 36
 Metrophanes, metropolitan of Proikonesos — 47
 Mitylene, metropolitans of — 73, 86
 Monastery of Saint:
 Anastasia Pharmakolatria — 67
 Andrew (Paros) — 44
 Antonios (Paros) — 44
 Evangelistria (Thebes) — 62
 George (Melos & Kimelos) — 64
 George (Paros) — 44
 George (Trapezous) — 8
 George (Vranokastron) — 63
 John the Forerunner (Skia-thos & Skopelos) — 46
 John the Forerunner tes Sketes (Verroia) — 3

John the Forerunner (Serres), — 33, 39
 John the Theologian (Paros) — 44
 Konstantinos (Naupaktos & Arta) — 53
 Kyriake (Paros) — 4
 Loukas Steriotes — 29
 Nicholas (Santorine) — 57
 Panagia Heliokallou — 63
 Panagia Phaneromene — 68
 Panagia Sigartsa (Wallachia) — 86
 Taxiarchai (Naxos) — 44
 Taxiarchai (Paros) — 44
 Theotokos Botzkovou — 48
 Theotokos Kosiniate — 63
 Theotokos Vernikovon — 43
 Theotokos Zlatarides — 86
 Monoepiskopos — 59
 Monokondyilion — 1 and *passim*
 Mukataa — 24
 Myra, metropolitan of — 59
 Mysterion (sacrament) — 1

N

Nation (genous) — 70
 Naupaktos & Arta, metropolis of — 43
 Naupaktos & Arta, metropolitans of — 21, 26, 59
 Naxos, island of — 44
 Nea Mone, monastery of (Chios) — 66
 Neilos, hieromonk — 4, 12, 13, 23
 Neilos, metropolitan of Metra & Athyra — 23
 Nektarios, hieromonk — 28, 49
 Nektarios, metropolitan of Trapezous — 38

Nemesos & Kytaia, metropolis of — 61
 Neokaisaria & Ineon, metropolitan — 5
 Neophytos, archbishop of Karpachos — 8
 Neophytos, archbishop of Melos & Kimelos — 69
 Neophytos, archbishop of Santorine — 28
 Neophytos, archimandrites — 28
 Neophytos, hieromonk(s) — 4, 13, 19, 27, 56, 60
 Neophytos, metropolitan of Gothia — 27
 Neophytos, metropolitan of Heraklia — 2
 Neophytos, metropolitan of Philippoupolis — 24
 Neophytos, metropolitan of Sevastia — 13
 Nicholas, the priest — 29
 Nikaia, metropolitans of — 7, 87
 Nikasgiane, village of — 63
 Nikephoros, hieromonk — 82
 Nikodemos, false bishop — 52
 Nikodemos, metropolitan of Mitylene — 86
 Nikomedia, metropolitans of — 2, 86

O

Officials — 1, 8, 24, 31, 32, 37, 44, 46, 47, 52, 77, 88, 89
 Oikonomos — 57
 Oikonomos George the priest — 10
 Oikonomos, Grand — 1
 Oka (okades, pl.) — 6, 43, 44, 76
 Orthodox — 1

Orthodox Confession — 1
 Ostiarios — 51

P

Pachomios, archbishop of Raidesto — 1
 Pachomios, metropolitan of Ikonion — 40
 Pachomios, metropolitan of Rhodes — 1
 Paisios, metropolitan of Nikomedia — 86
 Panagia, chapel of — 48
 Panegyria, fees of — 47, 48
 Pankratios, hieromonk — 12
 Parapolas, place of — 42
 Paraskevas, Grand Primmiderios — 51
 Paronaxia, metropolitans of — 4, 32, 33, 44
 Paros, island of — 4, 44
 Parthenios, formerly metropolitan of Drystra — 55
 Parthenios, metropolitan of Gothia & Kapha — 86
 Parthenios, metropolitan of Larissa — 8
 Parthenios, metropolitan of Nikomedia — 22
 Parthenios, metropolitan of Rhodes — 1
 Parthenios I, patriarch of Constantinople — 1
 Patriarchs of Alexandria — 61, 67
 Patriarchs of Constantinople — *passim*
 Patriarchs of Jerusalem — 1, 24, 35, 67
 Peloponnesos — 10, 78
 Petrales, hieromonk — 50
 Philadelphia, metropolitan of — 1, 37

Philaretos, hieromonk(s) — 5,
 15, 17, 22
 Philaretos, metropolitan of
 Thebes — 26
 Philippi & Drama, metropoli-
 tan of — 80
 Philippoupolis, metropolis of
 — 48
 Philippoupolis, metropolitan
 of — 24
 Philotheos, hieromonk — 20,
 22, 46
 Philotheos, metropolitan of
 Elasson & Domenikon — 18
 Philotimon — 57
 Phlorion, place of — 42, 45
 Pisidia, metropolitans of — 18,
 87
 Pogoniane, archbishop of — 82
 Polyphengos, diocese of — 32
 Porphyrios, bishop of Kydon-
 ia — 47
 Posiano, village of — 63
 Proestos — 57, 65
 Portarissa — 57
 Prastos, village of — 65
 Prespa, metropolitan of — 39
 Primmekerios, Grand — 51
 Proedros — 31, 41
 Proikonesos, metropolitans of
 — 47, 83
 Proilavo, metropolitan of — 57
 Prophet Elias, chapel of — 48
 Protekdikos — 51
 Protonotarios Panagiotes of
 Thermia — 10
 Protosynkelos — 30, 63
 Protosynkellos of the Great
 Church — 1, 2, 83

R

Raidesto, metropolitan of — 1
 Ralakes, Grand Ekklesiarches
 — 1

Razes, Demetrakes — 1
 Rhetor — 1
 Rhodes, metropolitans of —
 1, 2
 Romanso, bishop of Agathou-
 polis — 47
 Roxandra, wife of Manolakes
 — 51

S

Sacrament, see mysterion
 Saint Charalampos, chapel of
 — 46
 Saint Demetrios, chapel of —
 48
 Saint George, chapel of — 48
 Saint Hypatia, chapel of — 67
 Saint John the Forerunner,
 chapel of — 48
 Saint Nicholas, chapel of — 48
 Saint Nicholas, church of — 67
 Saint Panteleimon, church of
 — 67
 Saint Paraskeve, church of —
 48
 Saint Varvara, church of — 48
 Saint Taxiarchai, church of
 — 48
 Saint Stephanos, village of —
 42, 45
 Sakellarios, Manouel the priest
 — 10
 Sakellarissa — 57
 Sakellion, of Thermia — 10
 Samos, island of — 6
 Samos, metropolitans of — 6,
 55
 Santorine, archbishops of —
 28, 57
 Selyvria, metropolitan of — 71
 Serres, metropolis of — 33, 39
 Serres, metropolitan of — 33
 Sevastia, metropolitan of — 13

Skiathos & Skopelos, archdiocese of — 46
 Silvestros, patriarch of Alexandria — 67
 Siphnos, archbishop of — 52
 Skevophylax, of Thermia — 10
 Smyrna, metropolitans of — 26, 30
 Sogika & Klonion, place of — 68
 Sophia, metropolitan of — 54
 Sozopolis, metropolitan of — 81
 Spantones, Dikaiophylax — 1, 38
 Spantones, Protekdikos — 51
 Stages, Ioannes — 37
 Stamatelos, the priest — 78
 Stamates, of Trintaphyllos — 1
 Stavropegion — 3 and *passim*
 Stenemachon, village of — 48
 Sultan, government of — 4
 Symeon, hieromonk — 46
 Symeon, hieromonk and protosynkellos of the Great Church
 Symeon, metropolitan of Xanthe & Peritheorion — 84
 Synod of 1642 — 1
 Synod of 1691 — 1
 Synodical Tomos — 18, 21
 Synoikesion, fees of — 47
 Syrigos, Meletios — 1

T

Teacher of the Church — 1
 Thebes, metropolitans of — 26, 36, 62
 Theodorakes — 78
 Theodorakes, Ostiarios — 51
 Theodoretos, formerly metropolitan of Lakaidemonia — 1

Theodoros — 78
 Theodosios, metropolitan of Tornovo — 24
 Theokletos, metropolitan of Proikonesos — 83
 Theonas, metropolitan of Thessalonike — 67
 Theophanes, hegoumenos — 54
 Theophanes III, patriarch of Jerusalem — 67
 Theotokos, church of — 65
 Thessalonike, metropolis — 67
 Thessalonike, metropolitans of — 8, 9, 67, 86
 Timotheos II, patriarch of Constantinople — 46, 86
 Tornovo (Tirnov), metropolitan of — 24
 Trapezous (Trebizond), metropolitan of — 38
 Trapezous, province of — 38, 76
 Transfiguration, monastery of (Strophades) — 54
 Transubstantiation (metousiosis) — 1
 Tripolis, village of (Trapezous) — 38
 Tzia & Thermia, archbishop of — 10
 Tzoukes, Konstantinos — 1
 Tzoukes, Thomas — 1

V

Vartholomaïos, hieromonk — 16
 Vartholomaïos, metropolitan of Tzia & Thermia — 16
 Vathy, village of (Samos) — 6
 Verroia, metropolitan of — 3
 Verroia, proedros of — 31
 Verroia, province of — 3

Vestiarios — 42
Vizya, metropolitan of — 86
Vlamari, place of (Samos) — 6
Voethia — 21, 41, 74
Voevode of Houn grovlachia
(Wallachia) — 35, 86

W

Wallachia, see Houn grovlachia
White Sea, see Aegean Sea

X

Xanthe & Peritheorion, metro-
politan of — 84

Z

Zacharias, archbishop of San-
torine — 57
Zacharias, formerly bishop of
Petra — 19
Zacharias, Kyritzes — 41
Zacharias, metropolitan of
Elasson & Domenikon — 19
Zagorianos — 41
Zakynthos, island of — 54
Zenovia, nun — 54
Zetia — 21, 41, 47, 55, 74, 80
Zoe, wife of Alexandrakes — 51
Zosimas, formerly archbishop
of Achrida (Ohrid) — 41
Zosimas, proedros of Elasson
& Domenikon — 41
Zychna, metropolitan of — 33

APPENDIX A

HIERARCHS OF THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

ADRIANOPOLE

Athanasios (P) MS: May 1697-1701.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 1692-July 1709,
elected Patriarch of Constantinople.
As patriarch: July 1709-Dec. 1711.

AGATHOUPOLIS

Romanos MS: Aug. 1699.
Inclusive dates: 1699-1701.

AMASIA

Ioasaph** MS: 2 June 1696, resigned.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Ioannikios* MS: Elected, June 1696-7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1696-7 Aug.
1702, cited as dead.

Dionysios* MS: Elected, 7 Aug. 1702-28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 7 Aug. 1702-1724.

AMYKLA

Ioasaph MS: 3 Apr. 1696, former.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

ANCHIALOS

Daniel MS: May 1697-28 Apr. 1700, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Feb. 1687-13 Apr. 1700,
cited as dead.

Makarios MS: Elected, 28 Apr. 1700-May 1700.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 28 Apr. 1700-1713.
Before becoming Metropolitan of Anchialos,
Makarios was Bishop of Metra & Athyra: 26
May 1695-28 Apr. 1700. Also elected Metro-
politan of Naupaktos & Arta: 19 Feb. 1697-

5 July 1697, election invalidated.
See below under Metra & Athyra and Nau-
paktos & Arta.

ANDROS

Nathanael

MS: 17 Feb. 1699, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: 1691-17 Feb. 1699, cited as
dead.

Gregorios

MS: Elected, 17 Feb. 1699.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 17 Feb. 1699-?
1701-1705; 1713-?
Before becoming Archbishop of Andros, Gre-
gorios was Metropolitan of Klaudioupolis:
? -17 Feb. 1699.
See below under Klaudioupolis.

ANKYRA

Ioakeim*

MS: 15 June 1698-17 Feb. 1699.
Inclusive dates: Same.

ATHENS

Kyrillos

MS: 7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: 1699-1703, elected Metro-
politan of Paronaxia.
As Paronaxia: 1703-1722.
See below under Paronaxia.

CHALKEDON

Gabriel (P)

MS: Mar. 1691-7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: 1688-Aug. 1702, elected Pa-
triarch of Constantinople.
As patriarch: Aug. 1702-Oct. 1707.

Konstantios

MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: Aug. 1702-1720.

Ioannikios

MS: July 1761.
Inclusive dates: Elected, Mar. 1761-Jan. 1770.
Before becoming Metropolitan of Chalkedon,
Ioannikios was Metropolitan of Serres: 1745-
1761.

CHIOS

Gregorios

MS: Mar. 1691-31 May 1696, resigned.
Inclusive dates: 1676-31 May 1696, resigned.

Gennadios MS: Elected, 31 May 1696-16 Dec. 1701.
 Inclusive dates: Elected, 31 May 1696-25 Feb. 1714, elected Metropolitan of Heraklia.
 As Metropolitan of Heraklia: 25 Feb. 1714-19 Oct. 1718, died.

CHRISTIANOUPOLIS

Athanasios MS: 2 Aug. 1701.
 Inclusive dates: 1673/1681-1710.

DERKOS & NEOCHORION

Makarios MS: 1699, former.
 Inclusive dates: 11 Sept. 1673-Sept. 1688, cited as resigned.

Nikodemos MS: Mar. 1692-28 Mar. 1719.
 Inclusive dates: Elected, Sept. 1688-Dec. 1731, cited as dead.

DIDYMOTEICHON

Hieremias MS: May 1697.
 Inclusive dates: Oct. 1692-May 1697.

DRYSTRA

Gennadios MS: Mar. 1696, former.
 Inclusive dates: 1682-before Feb. 1687.
 Elected Metropolitan of Nikaia: Mar. 1696-1712.

Parthenios MS: Jan. 1700, former.
 Inclusive dates: Feb. 1687-Mar. 1689.

Athanasios* MS: Mar. 1691-July 1700.
 Inclusive dates: Mar. 1691-Oct. 1710.

Hierotheos MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.
 Inclusive dates: 1710-Mar. 1719.

ELLASON & DOMENIKON

Philotheos* MS: Deposed, Jan. 1697.
 Inclusive dates: 1695-Jan. 1697, deposed.

Zacharias MS: Elected, 16 Jan. 1697-c Mar. 1699.
 Inclusive dates: Same.
 Before becoming Archbishop of Ellason & Domenikon, Zacharias was Bishop of Petra: ? -16 Jan. 1697.

Zosimas MS: Mar. 1699.
 Inclusive dates: Mar. 1699-1708 (?).
 Before becoming **proedros** of Elasson & Domenikon, Zosimas was Archbishop of Achrida: 9 July 1695-Mar. 1699; 1708-1709.

EPHESOS

Theophanes MS: Mar. 1691-June 1696.
 Inclusive dates: 1688-1697.

EURIPOS

Kallinikos* MS: Aug. 1699-Jan. 1700.
 Inclusive dates: Same.

GANOS & CHORA

Konstantios* MS: Mar. 1692-Jan. 1700.
 Inclusive dates: Mar. 1692-1707.

Gregorios MS: 28 Mar. 1719.
 Inclusive dates: 1716-1728.

GOTHIA & KAPHA

Neophytos** MS: 27 Sept. 1697-28 Aug. 1698.
 Inclusive dates: Same.

Parthenios** MS: Aug. 1718.
 Inclusive dates: Unknown.

HERAKLIA & RAIDESTO

Neophytos (P) MS: Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702.
 Inclusive dates: Apr. 1689-1711, died.
 Elected patriarch 20 Oct. 1707, but did not serve.

Kallinikos (P?) MS: Aug. (Oct.) 1718.
 Inclusive dates: Aug. (Oct.) 1718-19 Nov. 1726.
 Elected patriarch (?): 19 Nov. 1726.
 Before becoming Metropolitan of Heraklia, Kallinikos was Metropolitan of Philippoupolis: 1711-Aug. (Oct.) 1718.

IKONION

Pachomios MS: 17 Feb. 1699.
 Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Anthimos MS: May 1699-23 May 1701.
 Inclusive dates: Same.

IOANNINA

Klemes

MS: Feb. 1697-5 July 1697.
Inclusive dates: 1680-1715.

KAISARIA

Kyprianos (P)

MS: Mar. 1691-15 Mar. 1702.
Inclusive dates: Mar. 1691-25 Oct. 1707,
elected Patriarch of Constantinople.
As patriarch: 25 Oct. 1707-May 1709; 7 Nov.
1713-28 Feb. 1714.

KARPATOS

Neophytos

MS: 1/2 Apr. 1696-June 1696.
Inclusive dates: 1680-1723.

KLAUDIOUPOLIS

Makarios**

MS: Aug. 1695, Elected Metropolitan of
Paronaxia.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.
As Metropolitan of Paronaxia: Aug. 1695-
1703.
See below under Paronaxia.

KRETE

Kallinikos

MS: Feb. 1697-6 Aug. 1699.
Inclusive dates: Same.

KYDONIA

Porphyrios*

MS: Election invalidated, 6 Aug. 1699.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Arsenios*

MS: 6 Aug. 1699.
Inclusive dates: before 6 Aug. 1699-1705,
died.

KYZIKOS

Kyrillos (P)

MS: Mar. 1691-7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: 1 Sept. 1684-4 Dec. 1711,
elected Patriarch of Constantinople.
As patriarch: 4 Dec. 1711-Nov. 1713.

Auxentios

MS: Aug. 1718-Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: 1712-1724.

LAKEDAIMONIA

Theodoretos MS: Mar. 1691, former.
Inclusive dates: 1670-1674.

LARISSA

Parthenios* MS: 1/2 Apr. 1696-28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: 1688-28 Mar. 1719.

LEMNOS

Parthenios MS: 27 Sept. 1697, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: ? -27 Sept. 1697 cited as dead.

Galaktion* MS: Elected, 27 Sept. 1697-c 28 Aug. 1698,
cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Makarios** MS: Elected, 28 Aug. 1698.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.
Before becoming Metropolitan of Lemnos,
Makarios was Metropolitan of Melenikon:
1689-before 28 Aug. 1698.

MARONIA

Kallinikos MS: May 1697-7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: 1696-1714.

MELENIKON

Makarios* MS: 28 Aug. 1698, former.
Inclusive dates: 1689-before 28 Aug. 1698.

Metrophanes MS: 28 Aug. 1698.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

MELOS & KIMOLOS

Gerasimos MS: Sept. 1700-3 Feb. 1701, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Neophytos MS: Elected, 3 Feb. 1701.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

METRA & ATHYRA

Makarios MS: 19 Feb. 1697.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 26 May 1695-(19
Feb. 1697, elected Naupaktos & Arta)-28
Apr. 1700.
As Naupaktos & Arta: 19 Feb. 1697-5 July
1697, election invalidated.

Elected: Anchialos: 28 Apr. 1700-1713.
See above under Anchialos and below under
Naupaktos & Arta.

Neilos MS: Mar. 1696-Aug. 1701.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 19 Feb. 1697-before
20 May 1711.

MITYLENE

Daniel** MS: Mar. 1696-Aug. 1701.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Nikodemos* MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: 1712-28 Mar. 1719.

NAUPAKTOS & ARTA

Meletios MS: Feb. 1697, Deposed.
Inclusive dates: Elected, Nov. 1691-Feb.
1697, deposed.

Makarios MS: Elected, 19 Feb. 1697-July 1697 election
invalidated.
Elected Metropolitan of Anchialos: 28 Apr.
1700-1713.
Before becoming Metropolitan of Anchialos,
Makarios was Bishop of Metra & Athyra: 26
May 1695-28 Apr. 1700.

Gregorios MS: Elected, 5 July 1697.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 5 July 1697-Oct.
1703.

NEOKAISARIA & INEON

Ignatios MS: Sept. 1695, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Iakovos MS: Elected, Sept. 1695-19 Dec. 1696, re-
signed.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Gregorios* MS: Elected, 17 Jan. 1697.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

NIKAIA

Ioannikios** MS: Mar. 1696, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Gennadios* MS: Elected, Mar. 1696.
Inclusive dates: Mar. 1696-1712.

- Before becoming Metropolitan of Nikaia, Gennadios was Metropolitan of Drystra: 1682-before Mar. 1691.
Gerasimos MS: 28 Mar. 1719.
 Inclusive dates: 1717-1728.
- NIKOMEDIA**
- Parthenios** MS: Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702.
 Inclusive dates: 1691-1712.
 Before becoming Metropolitan of Nikomedia, Parthenios was Metropolitan of Rhodes: 1676-1691.
 See below under Rhodes.
- Paisios (P)** MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.
 Inclusive dates: Aug. 1718-20 Nov. 1726, elected Patriarch of Constantinople.
 As patriarch: 20 Nov. 1726-Mid Sept. 1732, Aug. 1740-May 1743, Mar. 1744-28 Sept. 1748, May/June 1751-Sept. 1752.
- PARONAXIA**
- Ioasaph** MS: Aug. 1695, cited as resigned.
 Inclusive dates: Feb. 1687-c. Aug. 1695, cited as resigned.
- Makarios** MS: Elected, Aug. 1695-June 1699.
 Inclusive dates: Aug. 1695-1703.
 See above under Klaudioupolis.
- PETRA**
- Zacharias** MS: 16 Jan. 1697, Elected Elason & Domenikon.
 Inclusive dates: Unknown.
- PHILADELPHIA**
- Meletios** MS: Aug. 1698.
 Inclusive dates: 1685-1713.
- PHILIPPI & DRAMA**
- Gregorios*** MS: Sept./Dec. 1701, Deposed.
 Inclusive dates: Elected, Oct. 1692-Sept./Dec. 1701, deposed.

PHILIPPOUPOLIS

Neophytos MS: May 1697-Jan. 1701.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 7 Jan. 1689-8 Apr. 1711, resigned.

PISIDIA

Leontios MS: Jan. 1697-c 28 Mar. 1719, Died.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Kosmas MS: Elected, 28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.
Before becoming Metropolitan of Pisidia,
Kosmas was Bishop of Siphnos: ? -28
Mar. 1719.

POGONIANE

Malachias MS: 1 Mar. 1702, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Euthymios MS: Elected, 1 Mar. 1702.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 1 Mar. 1702-1721.

PRESPA

Gregorios MS: Nov. 1698.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

PROIKONESOS

Metrophanes* MS: Aug. 1699-15 Mar. 1702, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: 1677-15 Mar. 1702, cited as
dead.

Theokletos* MS: Elected, 15 Mar. 1702.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 15 Mar. 1702-1731.

PROILAVO

Gregorios MS: 25 Apr. 1700-July 1700.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

PROUSA

Kyrillos MS: Mar. 1696-June 1701.
Inclusive dates: 1689-1720.

RAIDESTO

Pachomios MS: Mar. 1691.
Inclusive dates: Mar. 1691-Oct. 1702, re-
signed.

RHODES

Parthenios

MS: Mar. 1691-Mar. 1692.
Inclusive dates: 1676-1691, elected
Metropolitan of Nikomedia.
As Metropolitan of Nikomedia: 1691-1712.
See above under Nikomedia.

Konstantios

MS: Elected, Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Ignatios

MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: 1702-1722.

SAMOS

Gedeon

MS: Feb. 1696-Jan. 1700 (?).
Inclusive dates: Same.

Gregorios (?)

MS: Jan. 1700.
Inclusive dates: Jan. 1700-7 Apr. 1701 (?).

SANTORINE

Gedeon**

MS: 26 Nov. 1697, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Neophytos*

MS: Elected, 26 Nov. 1697-25 Apr. 1700,
cited as resigned.
Inclusive dates: Same.

Zacharias

MS: Elected, 25 Apr. 1700.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 25 Apr. 1700-c 1740.

SELYVRIA

Makarios

MS: May 1701, deposed-resigned.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Leontios

MS: Elected, May 1701.
Inclusive dates: May 1701-1724.

SERRES

Anthimos

MS: Nov. 1698-7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: 1678-1706.

SEVASTIA

Neophytos

MS: Elected, June 1696.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

SIPHNOS

Kosmas**

MS: 28 Mar. 1719, Elected Metropolitan of Pisidia.

Inclusive dates: Unknown.

SMYRNA

Gregorios

MS: 5 July 1697-c 15 June 1698, Died.

Inclusive dates: 1689-15 June 1698, cited as dead.

Kyprianos

MS: Elected, 15 June 1698-7 Aug. 1702.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 15 June 1698-14 Oct. 1707, died.

SOPHIA

Gregorios

MS: Jan. 1700-18 May 1701, cited as resigned.

Inclusive dates: 1695-18 May 1701, cited as resigned.

Anastasios

MS: Elected, 23 May 1701.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 23 May 1701-before 1743.

SOZOPOLIS

Gerasimos

MS: 16 Dec. 1701, cited as resigned.

Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Kallinikos

MS: Elected, 16 Jan. 1701.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 16 Jan. 1701-c June 1722.

THEBES

Philaretos**

MS: 5 July 1697-28 Aug. 1698.

Inclusive dates: Same.

Athanasios*

MS: May 1700.

Inclusive dates: Unknown.

THESSALONIKE

Methodios

MS: 1/2 Apr. 1696, deposed.

Inclusive dates: 1687-1/2 Apr. 1696.

Ignatios

MS: Elected, 2 Apr. 1696-17 Feb. 1699.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 2 Apr. 1696-1712.

Ignatios*

MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.

Inclusive dates: Aug. 1718-1723.

TORNOVO (TIRNOVO)

Theodosios MS: May 1697.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.

TRAPEZOUS

Nektarios MS: Oct. 1698.
Inclusive dates: 1689-1706.

TZIA & THERMIA

Makarios** MS: 3 Apr. 1696, resigned.
Inclusive dates: ? -3 Apr. 1696, resigned.
Vartholomaios* MS: Elected, June 1696.
Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1696- ?

VERROIA

Ioasaph* MS: June 1692.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.
Makarios** MS: Aug. 1698.
Inclusive dates: Unknown.
Makarios MS: 28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: 1715-1721.

VIZYA

Ioakeim* MS: Aug. 1718-28 Mar. 1719.
Inclusive dates: 1708-Mar. 1719.

XANTHE & PERITHEORION

Damaskenos MS: 7 Aug. 1702, cited as dead.
Inclusive dates: 1671-Aug. 1702, cited as dead.
Symeon MS: Elected, 7 Aug. 1702.
Inclusive dates: Elected, 7 Aug. 1702-c 1708.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

**GOD'S INFINITY AND MAN'S MUTABILITY:
PERPETUAL PROGRESS
ACCORDING TO GREGORY OF NYSSA**

By EVERETT FERGUSON

George Bebis wrote an excellent article for the Fall, 1967, issue of this journal on "Gregory of Nyssa's 'De Vita Moysis': A Philosophical and Theological Analysis." That analysis may serve as a point of departure for this paper.

The sub-title of the *Vita Moysis* is "Concerning Perfection in Virtue." The theme of the work is perpetual progress in virtue.¹ "Continual development to what is better is the soul's way to perfection."² "Perfection is growth in goodness."³ This is no less the theme of Gregory's *Commentary on Canticles*.

Created being is ever changing for the better in its growth in perfection; along these lines no limit can be envisaged, nor can its progressive growth in perfection be limited by any term. In this way, its present state of perfection, no matter how great and perfect it might be, is merely the beginning of a greater and superior stage. Thus the words of the Apostle are verified: the stretching forth to the things that are before involves the forgetting of what has already been attained (Phil. 3:13). For at each stage the greater and superior good holds the attention of those who enjoy it and does not allow them to look at the past; their enjoyment of the superior perfection erases all memory of that which was inferior.⁴

Or again,

Thus though the new grace we may obtain is greater than what we had before, it does not put a limit on our final goal; rather, for those who are rising in perfection, the limit of the good that is attained becomes the beginning of the discovery of higher goods. Thus they never stop rising, moving from one new beginning to the next, and the beginning of ever greater graces is never limited of itself.⁵

Cardinal Daniélou and others have noted that a central doctrine

for Gregory is the understanding of perfection as perpetual progress.⁶ This is an original contribution of Gregory to the theology of the spiritual life.

The present study will look briefly at the background to the idea of perpetual progress, then note the imagery under which Gregory of Nyssa presents the idea, consider in some detail the theological grounding of the idea in the divine infinity and human mutability, and conclude with some observations relative to the nature of the spiritual life.

BACKGROUND OF THE IDEA

Some hints and components of the idea of perpetual progress in virtue may be found scattered in Gregory's predecessors and contemporaries.

Philo's *The Posterity of Cain* 14-15 takes up a favorite text of Gregory's, Exodus 20:21. He declares that the quest for the essence of God is an unattainable quest, because God is incomprehensible. Still the undertaking produces "a great good, namely to comprehend that God is incomprehensible and to see that he is invisible." Philo concludes that the quest itself is a foretaste of happiness (21).⁷

Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV. xi. 2, affords a good parallel to Gregory in his contrast between the Creator and the created and the assertion, "For as God is always the same, so also man, when found in God, shall always go on toward God." Later Irenaeus says man "should always possess something toward which he might advance" (IV. xx. 7).

Clement of Alexandria is one of the more important fore-runners of Gregory's thought. He speaks of "the soul which is ever improving in the knowledge of virtue and growth of righteousness . . . progressively stretching forth to the possession of impassibility until it attains to a perfect man" (*Stromata* VII. ii. 10). Clement, like Philo, anticipates features of Gregory's use of Moses entering the dark cloud where God was (Ex. 20:21): God is invisible, and he is "infinite" in the sense of being without dimensions and having no limit and so without any form (*Stromata* V. xii).

Although the general structure of Origen's system was antithetical to the theme of perpetual progress, he has a passage based on personal experience which corresponds to Gregory's emphasis.⁸ In the *Homilies on Numbers* XVII. 4 Origen likens the search for wisdom to a journey. "Where is the limit of the wisdom of God?"

Anyone who has made any progress in knowledge knows well that discoveries in spiritual things lead to other advances. Philippians 3:13 says to reach out to what is beyond the first attainments. Rather than dwelling in a permanent house, the soul which seeks wisdom "appears to advance like nomads with their tents." Another anticipation of the language of Gregory of Nyssa comes in the treatise *On Prayer* 25:2, which explains how the kingdom of God can be both present and prayed for as if it were not present. There is an advancement toward perfection. We journey toward perfection if "stretching forward to the things that are before" we "forget the things which are behind." As we advance unceasingly, the kingdom of God will be fully established in us, and then I Corinthians 15: 24-28 will be fulfilled.

A parallel to Gregory of Nyssa is found in the *Commentary on Isaiah* I:17 ascribed to Basil of Caesarea: "For as he who is being perfected stretches forward to the things before, so the sinner returns to the things behind" (PG 30, 144D). The majority opinion, however, according to Quasten, is against the authenticity of this work.⁹

Gregory of Nazianzos approaches Nyssa's view of the divine infinity in *Oration XXXVIII*. 7, 8. God is "like some great sea of Being, limitless and unbounded," and he is without beginning and end. As such he is incomprehensible, but this very fact becomes an enticement: as an object of wonder he becomes more an object of desire.¹⁰ The conclusion of the oration presents the life of Christ as something to be imitated as a continuous journey.

Unlike these incidental references, the theme of perpetual progress becomes characteristic of Gregory of Nyssa.¹¹ Völker, who emphasizes Gregory's indebtedness to the Alexandrian tradition and tends to play down his originality, yet says Gregory puts this idea in the middle point, repeats it almost endlessly, expresses it in paradoxical formulas, and finds it a true expression of his piety.¹²

IMAGERY AND EXAMPLES

Gregory of Nyssa employs a wide range of imagery to suggest the theme of perpetual progress in the soul's advancement in virtue. A favorite illustration, influenced by Philippians 3:13, is that of running a race.¹³ "For him who runs to the Lord the open field of the divine course is never exhausted."¹⁴ "Just as the end of life is the beginning of death, so also the stopping of the race

of virtue becomes the beginning of the race of evil."¹⁵ "The place with Me is so great that the one running in it is never able to cease from his progress."¹⁶

Equally popular with Gregory is the imagery of climbing higher.¹⁷ This may be by steps: "We see the Word, then, leading the bride up a rising staircase, as it were, up to the heights by the ascent of perfection."¹⁸ Or the figure may be of a ladder: "Once having set foot on the ladder which God set up (as Jacob says), Moses continually climbed to the step above and never ceased to rise higher, because he always found a step higher than the one he had attained."¹⁹

The general language of ascent leads in one passage to the specific imagery of flight: "For he who elevates his life beyond all things through such ascents does not fail to become ever higher than he was so that, as I think, in all things like an eagle his life might be seen above and beyond the cloud whirling around the ether of spiritual ascent."²⁰ "Once it is released from its earthly attachment, the soul becomes light and swift for its movement upward, soaring from below up to the heights. . . . The soul ever rises higher and will always make its flight yet higher."²¹

A frequently recurring image of another kind is that of growth. "The soul grows by participation in what transcends it."²²

Removing garments is used as an illustration of progressive purification.

For after removing her old tunic and divesting herself of all further clothing, the bride became much purer than she was. And yet, in comparison with this newly acquired purity, she does not seem to have removed her head-covering. Even after that complete stripping of herself she still finds something further to remove.

So it is with our ascent towards God: each stage that we reach always reveals something heavy weighing on the soul. Thus in comparison with her new found purity, that very stripping of her tunic now becomes a kind of garment which those who find her must once again remove.²³

The progress in perfection is like a continual creation: "Thus, in a certain sense, it is constantly being created, ever changing for the better in its growth in perfection."²⁴ There is always a new beginning: "Because of the transcendence of the graces which the bride finds ever beyond her, she always seems to be beginning anew."²⁵

Gregory connects the theme of progress with some of his favorite conceptions, for example that of the vision of God. The man living the life of virtue is always desirous to see God. "This truly is the vision of God: never to be satisfied in the desire to see him. One must always, by looking at what he can see, rekindle his desire to see more."²⁶ "The pure in heart will see God, according to the Lord's infallible word, according to his capacity, receiving as much as his mind can sustain; yet the infinite and incomprehensible nature of the Godhead remains beyond all understanding."²⁷

One of Gregory's profoundest insights is that the vision of God consists in following God. Here he unites the images of motion and sight. "So Moses, who eagerly seeks to behold God, is now taught how he can behold him: to follow God wherever he might lead is to behold God."²⁸ The *Commentary on Canticles* makes the same application of the episode in Exodus 33:21-23: "By this I think we are taught that he who wishes to see God, will see his Beloved only by constantly following after Him, and the contemplation of His face is really the unending journey towards Him, accomplished by following directly behind the Word."²⁹

Gregory's favorite theme of participation is also related to the perpetual progress, for one's advancement in virtue increases with his participation in God.³⁰

Since then no limit to virtue except evil has been shown, and the Divine does not admit of an opposite, the divine nature is found to be unlimited and infinite. Certainly he who follows after true virtue participates in nothing other than God, because he himself is absolutely virtue. Since then those who know what is good by nature desire participation in it and since this good has no limit, the participant's desire itself necessarily has no stopping place but stretches out with the limitless.³¹

Gregory not only gives comparisons of the perpetual progress, but he also points to Biblical personages who exemplified it. Moses is a prime example, for the theme of the *Vita Moysis* is continual progress in virtue. Representative of several statements in the work is the following: "The great Moses, as he was ever becoming greater, at no time stopped in his ascent, nor did he set a limit for himself in his upward course."³² The appeal to Moses is not limited to the work based on his life. "Everyone is familiar with those elevations which Moses enjoyed, for no matter how great he had become, he never stopped in his growth towards

perfection,"³³ and there follows a summary of the course of his life. The bride of Canticles is described in the same terms of progress as Moses. Just as the soul that looks to God constantly experiences an ever new yearning for him, "so the bride that ever runs towards her Spouse will never find any rest in her progress towards perfection."³⁴ Then follows a recapitulation of her experiences identical in form to the summaries of Moses' experience which punctuate the narrative of the Vita.

Abraham, too, serves as an exemplar of the life that journeys to the knowledge of God. His mind,

unimpeded by any object of sense, was never hindered from its journeying in quest of what lies beyond all that is known. . . . All the other things which in the course of his reasoning he was able to apprehend as he advanced. . . . using them all as supplies and appliances for his onward journey, ever making one discovery a stepping-stone to another, ever reaching forth unto those things which are before.³⁵

Moreover, David is seen as one who knew the exaltation of unending progress. "The great David enjoyed in his heart those glorious elevations as he progressed from strength to strength."³⁶

Paul is another representative of continual advancement.

Paul does not let the graces he has obtained become the limit of his desire, but he continues to go on and on, never ceasing his ascent. Thus he teaches us, I think, that in our constant participation in the blessed nature of the Good, the graces that we receive at every point are indeed great, but the path that lies beyond our immediate grasp is infinite.³⁷

DIVINE INFINITY

Gregory's doctrine of perpetual progress is grounded in his doctrines of God and man. God's infinity is fundamental to Gregory's distinction between Creator and creation and so to his whole philosophy and theology.³⁸ He gives an expanded explanation of what the divine infinity means in *Against Eunomios* II, 70 (NPNF, V, p. 257), but we need not explore the passage, since our concerns are the application Gregory makes of this to the spiritual life. Suffice it to say that "the Divine Nature, being limited in no respect, but passing all limitations on every side in its infinity, is far removed from those marks which we find in creation."³⁹

Writing against Eunomios, he lays down a principle which

connects his theology and his mysticism:

For to the Godhead it properly belongs to lack no conceivable thing which is regarded as good, while the creation attains excellence by partaking in something better than itself; and further, not only had a beginning of its being, but also is found to be constantly in a state of beginning to be in excellence, by its continual advance in improvement, since it never halts at what it has reached, but all that it has acquired becomes by participation a beginning of its ascent to something still greater, and it never ceases, in Paul's phrase, "reaching forth to the things that are before."⁴⁰

Continual improvement distinguishes creation from the Creator, who lacks no good thing.

For as long as a nature is in defect as regards the good, the superior existence exerts upon this inferior one a ceaseless attraction towards itself: and this craving for more will never stop: it will be stretching out to something not yet grasped: the subject of this deficiency will be always demanding a supply, always altering into the grander nature, and yet will never touch perfection, because it cannot find a goal to grasp, and cease its impulse upward. The First Good is in its nature infinite, and so it follows of necessity that the participation in the enjoyment of it will be infinite also, for more will be always being grasped, and yet something beyond that which has been grasped will always be discovered, and this search will never overtake its Object, because its fund is as inexhaustible as the growth of that which participates in it is ceaseless.⁴¹

The soul of man stretches out after the infinity of God.⁴²

One of the arguments advanced for the infinity of God is the following:

The divine by its very nature is infinite, enclosed by no boundary. If the divine be perceived as though bounded by something, one must by all means along with that boundary consider what is beyond it. For certainly that which is bounded leaves off at some point, as air provides the boundary for all that flies. . . . In the same way, God, if he be conceived as bounded, would necessarily be surrounded by something different in nature.⁴³

The same argument is used to establish that perfection in virtue is infinite:

Perfection in regard to all other things which are measured by sense perception is marked off by certain definite boundsBut in the case of virtue we have learned from the Apostle that the one limit of perfection is that it has no limit. . . .No Good has a limit in its own nature but is limited by the presence of its opposite, as life by death and light by darkness.⁴⁴

The passage continues with the quotation marked by note 31. Gregory concludes the passage with the definition of virtue quoted at the beginning, "For perhaps the perfection of human nature consists in its very growth in goodness."⁴⁵

Since the nature of God is the nature of Good (Perfection), if God is infinite, so also is perfection. The infinity of God is the basis for the infinity of virtue. Several passages touch on this point. God is unlimited in the good, for the eternal substance of God "contains all perfection within itself and cannot be limitedBut every perfection that He is conceived to have is present to an infinite and unlimited degree."⁴⁶ The good, unchecked by its opposite, goes on to infinity.⁴⁷ In a remarkable, but for Gregory not unusual, juxtaposition of metaphors Gregory says that the path of those who ascend to God is unlimited because God is like a never failing Fountain of which one could never say he had seen all.⁴⁸ There is no limit to the advance that can be made toward the good, because the good has no limit.⁴⁹ Therefore, Gregory provides a grounding for the idea of perpetual progress in the infinity of virtue, which in turn is a corollary of the infinity of God.

An early expression of the idea of progress is based on the inexhaustible nature of virtue. "For the possession of virtue is such that all men should partake of it according to their capacity, yet it will be always in abundance for those who thirst after it."⁵⁰ Since virtue is unlimited, it follows that participation in virtue brings no diminution or division of it. In later writings the divine infinity becomes explicitly the basis for human progress.

We are thus taught never to set any bounds to the immensity of the Godhead; nor can any measure of human knowledge ever become a limit to our comprehension of our goal, so as to force us to stop in our ever forward progress towards heaven.⁵¹

Vita Moysis II, 219-248 develops the theme of eternal progress in relation to the divine infinity. A key statement is the following:

No consideration will be given to anything as enclosing the infinite nature. It is not in the nature of what is unenclosed to

be grasped. But every desire for the good which is attracted to that ascent constantly expands as one progresses in pressing on to the good. . . . Thus no limit would cut off growth in the ascent to God, since no limit to the good is to be found.⁵²

Because of the infinite nature of virtue, participation in virtue can never be expressed as an attainment; it can only be expressed as movement. "In reference to virtue the grasping of perfection is impossible."⁵³ "The beloved face of the Lord once passed Moses by, and thus the soul of the Lawgiver kept going out of the state in which it had arrived, constantly following after the Word Who walked before."⁵⁴

Although limitless progress in the good is possible, evil, in contrast, is limited and finite. Progress in evil cannot go on indefinitely; a reversal to the good must follow. The limitation of evil in contrast to the good is expressed in the following selection:

Now that which is always in motion, if its progress be to good, will never cease moving onwards to what lies before it, by reason of the infinity of the course to be traversed:--for it will not find any limit of its object such that when it has apprehended it, it will at last cease its motion: but if its bias be in the opposite direction, when it has finished the course of wickedness and reached the extreme limit of evil, then that which is ever moving, finding no halting point for its impulse natural to itself, when it has run through the lengths that can be run in wickedness, of necessity turns its motion towards good: for as evil does not extend to infinity, but is comprehended by necessary limits, it would appear that good once more follows in succession upon the limit of evil.⁵⁵

Gregory's presupposition here is the mutability of human nature, which will be considered below. It may be noted that this reasoning is consistent with the idea of universal salvation.⁵⁶

The progress in the good is not limited to the present life. Another significant passage connecting infinite progress with the nature of God shows that since God is infinite, there is a greater and greater participation in grace throughout eternity. Gregory's theme of participation thus is a movement.

In our constant participation in the blessed nature of the Good, the graces that we receive at every point are indeed great, but the path that lies beyond our immediate grasp is infinite. This will constantly happen to those who thus share in the divine Goodness, and they will always enjoy a greater

and greater participation in grace throughout all eternity. . . .

In all the infinite eternity of centuries, the man who runs towards Thee constantly becomes greater as he rises higher, ever growing in proportion to his increase in grace.⁵⁷

God always remains beyond and incomprehensible, but man receives a knowledge of God and participates in his goodness "according to his capacity." Man's knowledge of God is limited by his capacity, not by the transcendent object.⁵⁸

This, then, is the doctrine that I think the Apostle is teaching about the ineffable nature of the Good, when he says that the eye does not know it even though it may see it. For the eye does not see it completely as it is, but only insofar as it can receive it.⁵⁹

The note of "according to capacity" brings this study to the second theological grounding of perpetual progress, the nature of man.

HUMAN MUTABILITY

Gregory of Nyssa sees the contrast between God and man to consist especially in the fact that God is unchangeable but man is mutable.⁶⁰ Human mutability is due to the created condition of man and so rests on the fundamental distinction between Creator and created. Man's very existence involved a change, a coming into being out of non-being. God, in contrast, always is. This distinction between Creator and created is one of Gregory's basic theological propositions,⁶¹ and stress on the changeableness of man is a key feature of his anthropology.⁶²

What difference then do we discern between the Divine and that which has been made like to the Divine? We find it in the fact that the former is uncreate, while the latter has its being from creation: and this distinction of property brings with it a train of other properties; for it is very certainly acknowledged that the uncreated nature is immutable, and always remains the same, while the created nature cannot exist without change; for its very passage from non-existence to existence is a certain motion and change.⁶³

This difference between God and man is brought into the discussion of the spiritual life.

In our changeable natures good and evil exist by turns, because of the power we have to choose equally either side of a

contradiction. The consequent evil becomes the limit of our good. . . . But the divine nature is simple, pure, unique, immutable, unalterable, ever abiding in the same way, and never goes outside of itself. It is utterly immune to any participation in evil and thus possesses the good without limit, because it can see no boundary to its own perfection, nor see anything that is contrary to itself.⁶⁴

That human beings are always changing is a frequently reiterated theme. "Everyone knows that everything placed in a world of change never remains the same but is always passing from one state to another, the alteration always bringing about something better or worse."⁶⁵ The soul partakes of this nature and is always unstable.⁶⁶ Once more there is an early statement of a cardinal principle for Gregory in the treatise *On Virginity*: "For it is impossible for our human nature ever to stop moving; it has been made by its Creator ever to keep changing."⁶⁷

There are different types of change and movement. Daniélou has taught us to see Gregory's distinction between cyclic change and progressive change.⁶⁸

There are two forms of movement; the one being ever towards what is good, and in this the advance has no check, because no goal of the course to be traversed can be reached, while the other is in the direction of the contrary, and of it this is the essence, that it has no subsistence.⁶⁹

There is such a thing as motion without progress, like attempting to climb a sand dune.⁷⁰ There is the cycle of bodily appetites in which there is a filling up and becoming empty again. "And we never stop this until we depart from this material life."⁷¹ Gregory's *Funeral Oration on Flacilla* describes life as a repetitious cycle.⁷² In contrast to the filling and emptying which is characteristic of this life, there is a good which is not limited.⁷³ More on this will come in the analysis of the nature of the spiritual life.

Gregory sees a virtue in human mutability. Unlike the cyclical change in which there is no progress there is the possibility of change to the better. The very fact that created beings change opens up the possibility of improvement. Creation itself was such a change. The passage from non-being to being means that the first and natural movement of created being is progress. Man's constant changeableness gives the possibility of change to the better.

The mutability of our nature becomes a pinion in our flight to

higher things.

For man does not merely have an inclination to evil, were this so, it would be impossible for him to grow in good, if his nature possessed only an inclination towards the contrary. But in truth the finest aspect of our mutability is the possibility of growth in good; and this capacity for improvement transforms the soul, as it changes, more and more into the divine. And so . . . what appears so terrifying (I mean the mutability of our nature) can really be a pinion in our flight towards higher things, and indeed it would be a hardship if we were not susceptible of the sort of change which is towards the better.⁷⁴

Again,

Though we are changeable by nature, the Word wants us never to change for the worse; but by constant progress in perfection, we are to make our mutability an aid in our rise towards higher things, and so by the very changeability of our nature to establish it immovably in good.⁷⁵

The "change from the worse to the better" is a characteristic idea.⁷⁶ But Gregory knows that the change can go either way.

The divine nature alone is beyond all change and variation, for it has nothing to which it needs to turn, being wholly incapable of evil and unable to turn to something better. . . But we men who exist in change and variation become through the activity of change either better or worse—worse whenever we depart from participation in the good, better again when we happen to change to the better. Since we are associated with evil through change, we need to change to the good.⁷⁷

Man's ability to change is a part of Gregory's characteristic emphasis on the freedom of the will. Man has the power of choice between good and bad.⁷⁸

Since being changeable you departed from the good, use your changeableness again for the good. And whence you are fallen turn again to that, since men have power of free will to choose which things they want, whether good or evil.⁷⁹

Man's mutability means his freedom of choice.

In mutable nature nothing can be observed which is always the same. . . We are in some manner our own parents, giving birth to ourselves by our own free choice according to whatever we wish to be.⁸⁰

It was noted above that man's advancement in relation to the

divine infinity was limited by his capacity. "According to capacity," however, is not a fixed limitation. Human mutability means that there is a growth in capacity to apprehend virtue.

The All-creating Wisdom fashioned these souls, these receptacles with free wills, as vessels as it were, for this very purpose, that there should be some capacities able to receive his blessings and become continually larger with the inpouring of the stream. Such are the wonders that the participation in the Divine blessings works: it makes him into whom they come larger and more capacious.⁸¹

With each blessing God dilates the capacity to receive other blessings. "Activity directed toward virtue causes its capacity to grow through exertion."⁸² The recipient remains filled with what he has attained, and in contrast to the cycle of filling and emptying the capacity is enlarged. This observation is already an infringement on the final phase of this study.

NATURE OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Gregory's doctrine is not solely grounded in theology. He seems also to speak out of his own experience. Certainly his writings contain much profound insight into the nature of spirituality and express truths which have been verified in the experience of other practitioners of the spiritual life. The theme of perpetual progress is particularly true to the nature of religious experience.

One area where this is the case pertains to the unlimited enjoyment of spiritual things. The spirit, unlike the flesh, does not know satiety in its enjoyment of spiritual things. The filling up and emptying of bodily appetites considered above is contrasted by Gregory with the satisfaction and growth of spiritual desires.

Satiety stops the greed of the glutton, and the drinker's pleasure is quenched at the same time as his thirst. And so it is with the other things. They all require a certain interval of time to rekindle the desire for the delights, which enjoyment carried to satiety has caused to flag. The possession of virtue, on the other hand, where it is once firmly established, is neither circumscribed by time nor limited by satiety. On the contrary, it always offers its disciples the ever-fresh experience of the fulness of its own delights. . . . The desire of virtue is followed by the possession of what is desired; and the interior goodness brings at the same time unceasing joy to the soul. For such is

the nature of this wonderful thing that it not only delights at the moment while one is enjoying it, but brings actual happiness at every instant of time.⁸³

This idea of continual enjoyment offers a different explanation from the one treated above where Gregory spoke of the capacity for enjoyment being enlarged, but the two ideas seem to be merged in a related passage:

The pleasure of drinking ceases with satiety, and likewise with eating an abundance extinguishes the appetite. If there is any other desire, it withers in the same manner at the participation in what is desired, and if it should come again, it is quenched again. . . . But I sought that good which to every age and time of life is equally good, whose satiety is not desired and whose surfeit is not found. Rather the appetite is extended with the participation, and the desire flourishes with the enjoyment and is not circumscribed by the attainment of what is desired. By as much as desire revels in the good, by so much more is it kindled for the pleasure. And the pleasure is stretched out with the desire and becomes always good according to the extension of time to those who participate in it.⁸⁴

Thus Gregory can declare that there is no satiety in love for the Beautiful.⁸⁵ And he extols "the enjoyment which does not cut off the desire by satiety, but rather nourishes the longing through the participation in the things desired."⁸⁶

Closely related to the above point is the experience of an ever increasing desire for God.

The soul that looks up towards God, and conceives that good desire for His eternal beauty, constantly experiences an ever new yearning for that which lies ahead, and here desire is never given its full satisfaction.⁸⁷

"For any enjoyment of Him only increases our desire for a greater share in His goodness."⁸⁸ The bride's "desire grows as she goes on to each new stage of development."⁸⁹ Participation renders the desire more intense, and the growth of the desire is in proportion to the participation.⁹⁰ The desire is never satisfied, because the object is infinite. Nor is it good for the spiritual nature of man for the desire to be satisfied. Moses desired to see God, not "according to his capacity" (see above), but according to God's true being, but God would not grant any request that brought to an end man's longing for Him.⁹¹

This never satisfied desire might seem to introduce a problem of

despair into the spiritual life. Is it not a disappointment never to attain the goal, to be always "on the way"? Here is the paradox, but one faithful to spiritual experience. Every attainment is a real attainment, and one has the sense of accomplishment or fulfillment; yet there is no stopping. There is both satisfaction and expanding desire. When Moses asked to see God "face to face," Gregory first explains that his petition was (in a sense) granted and yet Moses was led to despair by being told that what he requested was impossible to human life.⁹² More boldly, Gregory later resolves the paradox of satisfaction and desire in another paradox: "The divine voice granted what was requested in what was denied."⁹³ Moses was permitted to see (the "back parts" of) God but was not promised any cessation of his desire for God. So there is an attainment. In another way of looking at the problem, the satisfaction consists in going on with the quest.

In this way the bride is, in a certain sense, wounded and beaten because of the frustration of what she desires, now that she thinks that her yearning for the Other cannot be fulfilled or satisfied. But the veil of her grief is removed when she learns that the true satisfaction of her desire consists in constantly going on with her quest and never ceasing in her ascent, seeing that every fulfillment of her desire continually generates a further desire for the Transcendent.⁹⁴

The soul desirous of God always discovers more and more of the Object. Here again it is true to the nature of the spiritual life that there are always new vistas which open up with each new height gained in the advance toward God. What is attained is the beginning point for new discoveries.⁹⁵ Every taste of the Lord is an incitement to further enjoyment.

The fountain of grace constantly draws to itself all those who thirst. . . . Here He puts no limit on our thirst, nor on our movement towards Him nor on the satisfaction of our thirst; but He has created our tendency to thirst, to drink, and to move towards Him by a command that is constant and perpetual. To those who have tasted and seen by experience that the Lord is sweet (Ps. 33.9), this taste becomes a kind of invitation to further enjoyment. And thus the one who is rising towards God constantly experiences this continual incitement towards further progress.⁹⁶

Every perfection is the beginning of a greater good.

And yet the final stage of all a soul's previous attainments

becomes the beginning of her introduction to all that still lies beyond. . . .

And yet this climax [seeing God] of all she has now attained becomes the beginning of her hope for the things that lie ahead. . . .

Rather, the soul that is rising towards transcendent truth in the ways of higher understanding should be so disposed that every stage of perfection that is possible for human nature should be merely the beginning of a yearning for things more sublime.⁹⁷

Gregory sees the greatest obstacle to grace to be a relaxation of effort to make progress.

To one who stretches himself up to the higher life what has been said provides amply for true wisdom. To him who shows weakness in toiling for virtue there would be no gain even if many more things should be written. . . . The continual development of life to what is better is the soul's way to perfection.⁹⁸

The need for human effort is constantly stressed.⁹⁹ At the same time, God gives us the power.

We must therefore constantly arouse ourselves and never stop drawing closer and closer in our course. For as often as He says *Arise, and Come*, He gives us the power to rise and make progress.¹⁰⁰

Here we meet Gregory's synergism. To the human effort God opens the path of progress.¹⁰¹

CONCLUSION

Virtue is "both the work and the reward of those who have accomplished it."¹⁰² The desire for God is joy, and the seeking is the vision of God. Here is perhaps the ultimate answer to the problem of despair in an ever expanding system. The final word should be Gregory's. "The finding is the continuous search itself, for the seeking is not one thing and the finding another. But the reward of the search is the seeking itself."¹⁰³

FOOTNOTES

1. "Progress in Perfection" Gregory of Nyssa's *Vita Moysis* was the subject of my contribution to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford, September, 1971.
2. *Vita Moysis* II, 306, PG 44, 425A. (I shall give the section numbers from the edition prepared by J. Daniélou for *Sources Chrétiennes*, Paris, 1955, and the reference in Migne, which is also given in the margins of Musurillo's edition, Leiden, 1964. For other works I shall be content with the Migne references, which again can be found in the Leiden edition.
3. *Ibid.* I, 10; PG 44, 301C. Cf. *On Perfection* (PG 46, 285C), "For this is truly perfection: never to stop growing towards what is better and never placing any limit on perfection." English translation by Virginia Woods Callahan in *Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 58 (Washington, 1967), p. 122.
4. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 885D-888A. English translations of this work will be taken from Jean Daniélou and Hubert Musurillo, *From Glory to Glory* (New York, 1961). This quotation is from p. 197.
5. *Ibid.* 941 C, *Glory*, p. 213.
6. Jean Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique* (Paris, 1944), especially pp. 291ff., "La colombe et la ténèbre dans la mystique byzantine ancienne," *Eranos Jahrbuch*, 23 (1954), esp. pp. 409ff., "Mystique de la ténèbre chez Grégoire de Nysse," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Vol. 2, col. 1872-1885, and the Introduction to *From Glory to Glory*, pp. 46-71. Walther Volker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker* (Wiesbaden, 1955), pp. 186ff. does not emphasize the idea of progress so much.
7. Cf. *On the Change of Names* 7, 9.
8. See the distinctions made by Brooks Otis, "Nicene Orthodoxy and Fourth Century Mysticism," *Actes du XII^e Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines*, 1961 (Belgrade, 1964), Vol. 2, pp. 475-484.
9. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Vol. 3 (Utrecht, 1960), pp. 218f.
10. The same language is found in *Oration XLV*. 3. *Oration XXVIII*. 2-4 makes the familiar point that man may know that God is but not what he is.
11. Cf. Otis, *op. cit.*, on the essential difference in Gregory from his predecessors. Cf. also his "Cappadocian Thought as a Coherent System," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 2 (1958), pp. 95-124.
12. Völker, *op. cit.*, pp. 283f.
13. Daniélou, *Platonisme*, pp. 294, 297ff.
14. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 876C; *Glory*, p. 191.
15. *Vita Moysis* I, 6, PG 44, 301 A.
16. *Ibid.* II, 242, PG 44, 405B. Cf. the "wide and roomy stadium" of II, 246, PG 44, 408A.
17. Daniélou, *Platonisme*, pp. 293f.
18. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 876B; *Glory*, p. 190.

19. *Vita Moysis* II, 227; PG 44, 401B.
20. *Ibid.* II, 307; PG 44, 425B.
21. *Ibid.* II, 224-25; PG 44, 401A. Cf. Daniélou, "La colombe. . ." pp. 396ff. on the wings of the dove.
22. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 876A, *Glory*, p. 190. Cf. *On the Soul and the Resurrection* PG 46, 105B-C.
23. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 1029B-C; *Glory*, p. 264.
24. *Ibid.* PG 44, 885D, *Glory*, p. 197.
25. *Ibid.* 876B, p. 190.
26. *Vita Moysis* II, 239, PG 44, 404D.
27. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 941A; *Glory*, p. 212. Cf. *On the Beatitudes*, Sermon 6, on Matt. 5 8.
28. *Vita Moysis* II, 252, PG 44, 408D.
29. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 1028A; *Glory*, p. 263.
30. David L. Balas, *Metousia Theou* (Rome, 1966), esp. pp. 152-57.
31. *Vita Moysis* I, 7, PG 44, 301A-B.
32. *Ibid.* II, 227, PG 44, 401B.
33. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 1025B, *Glory*, p. 261.
34. *Ibid.* 1036A, p. 268; cf. 888C.
35. *Against Eunomios* 12 (PG 45, 940D-941A, Jaeger I, 252-253). English translation from *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (abbreviated NPNF), Series Two, Vol. 5, p. 259.
36. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 941A, *Glory*, p. 212.
37. *Ibid.* 940D-941A, p. 211.
38. See Ekkehard Mühlenberg, *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 100ff. for his doctrine of infinity, and pp. 147ff. for this doctrine as a grounding for the theme of progress. James E. Hennessy, "The Background, Sources, and Meaning of Divine Infinity in St. Gregory of Nyssa," Dissertation at Fordham University, 1963, should be better known.
39. *Against Eunomios* 8 (PG 45, 796A, Jaeger, II, 210. 9-11, NPNF V, p. 209), cf. also PG 45, 772A (Jaeger, II, 188. 11-26, NPNF V, p. 201)
40. *Ibid.* (PG 45, 797A, Jaeger, II, 212. 5-14, NPNF V, p. 210).
41. *Against Eunomios* I, 290-291 (PG 45, 340D, Jaeger, I, 112. 7-20; NPNF V, p. 62).
42. Cf. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 873D-876A, *Glory*, p. 190.
43. *Vita Moysis* II, 236, PG 44, 404B.
44. *Ibid.* I, 5, PG 44, 300C-D. Cf. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 885C-D, *Glory*, p. 196.
45. See note 3.
46. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 873C, *Glory*, p. 189.
47. *On the Soul and the Resurrection* PG 46, 96C-97A, NPNF V, p. 450.
48. *Comm. on Cant.* PG 44, 997D and 1000B, *Glory*, pp. 245f.
49. *Catechetical Oration* 21 (PG 45, 57D-60A).

50. **On Virginité** 4 (PG 46, 337B).
51. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 892A-B; **Glory**, p. 200. Cf. 885C-888A; **Glory**, pp. 196f.
52. **Vita Moysis II**, 238-239; PG 44, 404C-D. Cf. **On the Soul and the Resurrection** PG 46, 96C-97A; NPNF V, p. 450. Mühlenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 160.
53. **Vita Moysis I**, 6, PG 44, 301A; cf. II, 252-55, PG 44, 409A-B.
54. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 1025A; **Glory**, p. 261. Cf. 1032C; p. 266.
55. **On the Making of Man** 21:2 (PG 44, 201B-04A, NPNF V, pp. 410f.). Cf. Balās, *op. cit.*, p. 137; Jerome Gäth, **La conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nysse** (Paris, 1953), pp. 137-42, J. Daniélou, **L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse** (Leiden, 1970), pp. 186ff. discusses the "acme of evil."
56. J. Daniélou, "L'apocatastase chez Saint Grégoire de Nysse," **Recherches de science religieuse** 30 (1940), pp. 328-47.
57. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 940D-41A, **Glory**, pp. 211f. Gäth, *op. cit.*, pp. 200ff.
58. Daniélou, **L'être et le temps**, p. 108.
59. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 941B, **Glory**, p. 212.
60. Daniélou, **L'être et le temps**, pp. 95ff.
61. Balās, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-49.
62. For studies of Gregory's anthropology to Gäth add G. B. Ladner, "The Philosophical Anthropology of Saint Gregory of Nyssa," **Dumbarton Oaks Papers**, (1958), pp. 59-94; J. P. Cavaernos, "Gregory of Nyssa on the Nature of the Soul," **Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, 1 (March, 1955), pp. 133-41, E. V. McClear, "The Fall of Man and Original Sin in the Theology of Gregory of Nyssa," **Theological Studies**, 9 (1948), pp. 175-212; J. Pelikan, "The Mortality of God and the Immortality of Man in Gregory of Nyssa," **The Scope of Grace**, ed. P. J. Hefner (Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 79-97.
63. **On the Making of Man** 16 12 (PG 44, 184C; NPNF V, p. 405).
64. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 873C-76C; **Glory**, p. 190. The whole passage contains many ideas encountered in this study. Cf. *ibid.* 885D-88A (**Glory**, pp. 196f.) for Gregory's classification of being into spiritual and material, and the spiritual into Creator and created.
65. **Vita Moysis II**, 2; PG 44, 328A.
66. **On the Soul and the Resurrection** PG 46, 113B-C; NPNF V, pp. 455f.
67. **On Virginité** 7 (PG 46, 352C). Michel Aubineau in his edition of the treatise in *Sources Chrétiennes*, No. 119 (Paris, 1966), p. 347 (cf. p. 176) notes parallels from earlier authors and considers this idea a root of Gregory's doctrine of progress.
68. "La Colombe," pp. 400ff.
69. **Catechetical Oration** 21 (NPNF V, p. 492).
70. **Vita Moysis II**, 244; PG 44, 405C.
71. *Ibid.* II, 61; PG 44, 344A-B.
72. Jaeger, IX, 485. 10-13.

73. **De Mortuis** PG 46, 500D-501D.
74. **On Perfection** PG 46, 285B-C, **Glory**, pp. 83f.
75. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 945C, **Glory**, p. 216.
76. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 885D-888A, 980B-992B.
77. **On the Inscriptions of the Psalms II.** iv (PG 44, 500B).
78. Werner Jaeger, **Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius** (Leiden, 1954), pp. 85-107, Gaith, *op. cit.*
79. **On the Inscriptions of the Psalms I.** vii (PG 44, 460B-C).
80. **Vita Moysis II**, 3, PG 44, 328B. Cf. **On Ecclesiastes 6** (PG 44, 704A), **Catechetical Oration 39**.
81. **On the Soul and the Resurrection** PG 46, 105A-C (NPNF V, p. 453).
82. **Vita Moysis II**, 226, PG 44, 401B.
83. **The Beatitudes 4** (PG 44, 1244D-45A). English translation by Hilda C. Graef in **Ancient Christian Writers**, No. 18 (Westminster, Maryland, 1954), p. 127.
84. **On Ecclesiastes 2** (PG 44, 648D-649A).
85. **On the Soul and the Resurrection** PG 46, 96C-97A.
86. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 1084C-D.
87. *Ibid.* 1033D-1036A, **Glory**, p. 268. Cf. 1025C-D and 1037B.
88. *Ibid.* 777B, p. 155.
89. *Ibid.* 876B, p. 190.
90. Daniélou, **Platonisme**, p. 295.
91. **Vita Moysis II**, 232-33, PG 44, 404A.
92. *Ibid.* II, 220, PG 44, 400A.
93. *Ibid.* II, 232, PG 44, 404A.
94. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 1037 B-C, **Glory**, p. 270. Cf. 885D-888A.
95. See passages cited at footnotes 4, 5, and 40. **Vita Moysis II**, 226ff., PG 44, 401B-D. Mary Emily Keenan, "**De Professione Christiana and De Perfectione: A Study of the Ascetical Doctrine of Saint Gregory of Nyssa**," **Dumbarton Oaks Papers**, 5 (1950), p. 174.
96. **Comm. on Cant.** 44, 941D, **Glory**, p. 213. Cf. 1033D-36A The idea is amply documented in earlier references.
97. *Ibid.* 889B, D and 892B, **Glory**, pp. 199f.
98. **Vita Moysis II**, 305f, PG 44, 425A.
99. See **On the Christian Mode of Life** (Jaeger, VIII, I, pp. 44-45, Callahan, *op. cit.*, pp. 129f.).
100. **Comm. on Cant.** PG 44, 876C, **Glory**, p. 191.
101. On the necessity of free will for perfection cf *ibid.* 876D-77A and note 78.
102. **Beatitudes 4** (PG 44, 1245C, Graef, *op. cit.*, p. 128). For virtue its own reward cf. **Comm. on Cant.** 44, 765 B-C
103. **On Ecclesiastes 7** (PG 44, 720C).

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Zavallis Printing House who did the printing. Due credit must also be given to the Archbishopric of Cyprus and Archbishop Makarios for providing the funds for this great edition which, incidentally, was made on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Greek Revolution of 1821: Without their assistance this book would have never seen the light of publication.

In sum we may say that the first volume of **Ancient Cyprus in Greek Sources** is a great achievement. From the high quality of this volume it is possible to greet Dr. Hadjoannou's enterprise with the greatest respect and enthusiasm and to predict that on its completion it will prove to be a monumental work for Cyprus.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
Hellenic College

Constance Head, **Justinian II of Byzantium**. Madison, Wisc. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1972. Pp. XI, 181. \$10.00.

The purpose of this book is to present an integrated picture of Justinian II, the person, the ruler, and his work. For several reasons, and perhaps because he has been overshadowed by Justinian the Great, Justinian II has remained a very obscure and, to a great degree unjustifiably, a maligned Emperor. Professor Head is to be commended for having undertaken the difficult job of rehabilitating the Emperor's name. To be sure, the author does not present any startling innovations for she has had no new sources to deal with. Nevertheless both the student and the scholar will find this a delightful book. Its crisp, straightforward and simple, even sensitive and at times poetic, style keeps the reader's interest very much alive. It includes every significant detail of Justinian's life and work and maintains a good balance.

The important question is, of course, whether the author's revisionist approach succeeds in its goal. Does Dr. Head prove that Justinian was not an inept megalomaniac and a cruel figure who used his imperial power for self-gratification, as historical opinion has maintained for many years? Professor Head acknowledges that Justinian II made very serious mistakes and that during his second reign he proved very cruel to his adversaries. But she also argues logically and convincingly that Justinian was an able ruler who initiated important administrative, military, religious, and diplomatic changes. Justinian's "first term" was both significant and constructive.

The author's treatment of the Council in Trullo is both perceptive and well done. On the significance of canon 62 and other canons for Greek classical survivals the author might have benefited from my article "Canon 62 of the Synod in Trullo and the Slavic Problem" (*Byzantina*, Vol. 2 (1970) pp. 21-35.) Most probably it was because of his role in the Council in Trullo that Justinian II was canonized by the Byzantine Church. F. G. Holweck and A. Fortescue, whose works Professor Head cites, erred when they wrote that Justinian's name has been expunged from the Orthodox Calendar. The official list of saints written by the specialist Sophronios Eustratiades and published by the Official Publishing House of the Church of Greece

(*Hagiologion tes Orthodoxou Ekklesias*, Athens, no date) includes Justinian's name. His memory is celebrated on July 15.

There are a few other areas with which this reviewer takes exception. For example the statement that "Byzantium . . . exemplifies the theory of absolutism par excellence" (p. 5) is overstated. Justinian's own fate, and the fate of several other Emperors who were deposed by violence indicate that the Empire was ruled by an *ennomos basileia* rather than by an absolute monarchy. The Emperor issued laws, but he himself was subject to the law. One more point there is no need to perpetuate the error that Suidas was a lexicographer (p. 14n.1). Suda not Suidas is the name of the tenth century lexicon.

The author's treatment of Justinian's relation with the papacy is solely based on Western sources, in particular the *Liber Pontificalis* whose author had every reason to support the primacy of the bishop of Rome.

Of course these are minor critical observations which are not intended to detract from what I consider a valuable and delightful but expensive book

DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS
Stockton State College

Rae Dalven, *Anna Comnena*. Twayne's World Authors Series. New York Twayne Publishers, 1972. Pp. 186.

A glance at Charles Diehl's delightful book *Byzantine Empresses* would reveal that the Byzantine Empire did not lack prominent women who played very important roles in government, society, the Church, or in learning. Eudocia-Athenais (one of my favorites), Pulcheria, Theodora (Justinian's wife), Irene, Theodora the Blessed, Kassiane, Anna Delassina, Irene (wife of John Comnenos), and Anna Comnena were distinguished women who in one way or another left their imprint in some aspect of the Byzantine Empire's history.

Anna Comnena, the subject of the book under review, was not an Empress even though she had aspired to become like Irene, a *basileus* rather than an Empress. She was one of the best educated women of the medieval world with a variety of intellectual interests—in history, classical literature, medicine, the Bible, and other fields. Anna proved herself a most marvellous woman, politically ambitious and the most important historical source of her father's reign. The present volume succeeds very completely in its objective, for Anna Comnena emerges from its pages as a very lively and vigorous person.

Dr. Dalven has written a tightly knitted and a detailed study of Anna's character, work, and significance. While the author has many words of praise for Anna, she has painted a rather balanced picture. She praises where

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE LIBRI CAROLINI AND THE IMAGE CONTROVERSY

By STEPHEN GERO

The Byzantine iconoclastic struggle had only few ideological echoes in the Latin West.¹ However, in the so-called *Libri Carolini*, a substantial polemical work in four books, we do possess a most important literary witness to the western attitude toward the whole problem of the rôle of visual art in religious worship.² Though the writing of the *Libri Carolini*³ was provoked by the eastern developments — they refute, point by point, assertions made at the iconophile Second Council of Nicaea⁴ — more significantly, they reflect the attitude toward images that was held by Charlemagne and his court theologians. The primary aim of this paper is to attempt an elucidation of this “image philosophy” of the LC, and to decide to what extent the ideology of the LC may have influenced contemporary Carolingian art. On account of the polemical nature of the treatise it will be necessary first to delimit the evidence on the basis whereof the LC judge the Greek image controversy. Then the question of the extent to which the LC should be regarded as a production of political expediency, rather than as an expression of genuine religious concern, will be touched upon. It will also be necessary to investigate the degree to which the LC exhibit a real grasp of the philosophical presuppositions and the theological issues at Nicaea II.

The redactorial history of the LC will now be sketched out, but only very briefly, since this has been quite adequately dealt with in the literature.⁵ The Greek Acts of Nicaea II⁶ were brought back to Pope Hadrian I by the two papal legates. A very poor Latin translation of these Acts was prepared in Rome; this translation only was then sent by the Pope to the Frankish court. A list of objections to the Council’s decisions was made at Charles’ order and given to Hadrian by Angilbert. Hadrian’s reply to these capitula is extant.⁷ The Frankish capitula were extracts from the LC but most probably not identical with them.⁸ The LC were revised, very slightly, in view of the papal objections, and

issued probably around 792 — at any rate before the Council of Frankfurt (794).

A presentation copy of the LC⁹ sent to Hadrian is no longer extant. The LC were not copied in the later Middle Ages; in fact the work was rediscovered and published only in 1549, from a Carolingian minuscule MS, now in Paris. (Bibliothèque d'Arsenal MS 663). In 1865 Vatican MS lat. 7207 was discovered in the papal archives; the Arsenal codex soon proved to be an apograph of this MS.¹⁰ The Vatican MS was a working copy, written by several hands; it contains a great number of corrections and erasures, and lacks part of Book I and all of Book IV.¹¹ B. Bischoff recently discovered at Corbie a page from a large folio copy of the LC, made around or after 850.¹²

The intensely debated question of the authorship of the LC will not directly concern us here. But the main points will be rapidly sketched out, for the sake of orientation. To begin, though the work is put forth under Charles' aegis, royal authorship is not a serious possibility — the LC betray a degree of theological and linguistic proficiency which Charles certainly could not have possessed.¹³ Authorship of the work, the literary unity of which is quite apparent, has been assigned either to Alcuin¹⁴ or to Theodulf of Orleans.¹⁵ The most recent arguments center on the provenance of the scriptural quotations in the LC, whether these should be traced back to readings characteristic of the Spanish Mozarabic liturgies, or whether they can be satisfactorily accounted for as readings from the Old Latin translations of the Bible. The first alternative, put forth by A. Freeman, would lend weight to the presumed authorship of Theodulf of Orleans, who had Spanish and Septimanian connections. The second alternative, urged by L. Wallach, has an immediate negative force against the "Mozarabic" argument for Theodulfian authorship, but makes no direct connection with Alcuin. At any rate, the authorship question is peripheral to our purposes here. Moreover, the relevance of the Mozarabic — *Vetus Latina* argument for a quick resolution of the question of authorship is lessened when Alcuin's own knowledge of the Spanish liturgy is injected into the controversy.¹⁶ But obviously no justice can be done here to these rather technical issues of biblical and patristic source analysis.

Though the theological opinions of the LC will directly interest us only insofar as they relate to the image question, it is obviously of some importance to identify the LC's basic religious outlook:

the image problem was essentially a theological issue, not one of connoisseurship, as we shall see. The LC do not display a theological outlook which is very different from representative Carolingian orthodoxy. They are characterized by an attenuated Augustinianism, mediated through Gregory the Great. Gregory's views are followed on such questions as the number of saved souls (equal to the number of fallen angels), purgatory, predestination, and the nature of original sin.¹⁷ We shall later see that in the matter of images too, the LC constantly appeal to Gregory. The well-known western addition to the Trinitarian creed, the *Filioque*, is accepted by the LC and used to impugn the orthodoxy of the Patriarch Tarasios.¹⁸ The LC also reject Tarasios' *contribulus* (*homophylos*) as a term to characterize the relations within the Godhead, on the grounds that it is not sanctioned in Latin writings (Hilary, Augustine) on the Trinity.¹⁹ The extended confession of faith inserted at the beginning of Book III is the Pelagian version of the creed, attributed to Jerome.²⁰ However, we can't dwell on these matters here.

II

In trying to understand the LC one must realize that in many ways the work is a political *Streitschrift*. Though to regard the LC as nothing but a piece of propaganda would be misleading, it must be recognized that one of the aims of the author was to discredit the eastern Emperors, by attacking their orthodoxy, and thus to show that these heretics were undeserving of political loyalty. In several places this bias is manifested: Constantine V is refused the title *imperator* and is called simply "their king"²¹; Irene and Constantine VI are accused of blasphemy, of claiming to reign conjointly with God.²² The LC's indignation at Irene's intervention in ecclesiastical affairs²³ is another quasi-political thrust, foreshadowing the Frankish claim in 800 that the throne was vacant.²⁴ The preposterous charge that Nicaea II was really aiming at Frankish customs when it condemned the Iconoclasts²⁵ shows perhaps the resentment Charles felt at not being invited to the deliberations.²⁶ The LC assert, somewhat self-consciously, the independence and superiority of Latin Frankish Christianity vis-à-vis the corrupt Greeks, with obvious implications for the *translatio imperii*.

However, it would be incorrect to impute every twist of the LC's arguments against the Greeks to purely political motivations.

There is no foundation to the often-repeated assertion that the LC perhaps **deliberately** misinterpreted the expressions of Nicaea II.²⁷ It is obvious that the author of the LC was under the sincere impression that in the Latin version he had the *ipsissima verba* of the Council. Repeatedly Nicaea II is castigated for the bad Latinity, the barbarous style of its *Acta*.²⁸ The LC do not seem to be conscious of the fact that the original proceedings were written in Greek, and betray no knowledge of Greek language or literature, secular and patristic.

This Latin insularity is shown, for instance, when the LC curtly reject the witness of Gregory of Nyssa, the great Cappadocian father: "Gregorii Niseni episcopi et vita nobis et praedicatio sit ignota."²⁹ Disputing the authenticity of the Epistle of Symeon the Stylite quoted by the Council,³⁰ the LC again declare: "sanctum Symeoneum cuius vita et praedicatio manet ignota."³¹ For his own part, the author of the LC restricts himself to the authority of Latin fathers such as Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory the Great. Though the Greek appeals to Athanasios,³² John Chrysostom,³³ and Cyril³⁴ are not likewise *a priori* rejected, the LC show no firsthand acquaintance with their works. More such examples of *rusticitas* could be given; in particular we shall later note the LC's lack of familiarity with the Platonic and Aristotelian concepts on which the Greeks based their arguments.

A second source of error was, as we have already indicated, the LC's exclusive reliance on the faulty translation. It is well known that the quite distinct concepts of the veneration to be given to images (*proskynesis timetike*) and the adoration that is paid to the Godhead alone (*latreia*) were both rendered by *adoratio*.³⁵ The LC in turn aggravated the situation by refusing to admit shades of meaning to *adoratio*, restricting it to that worship which is the prerogative of the Deity. Such a restriction already involves an element of hostile interpretation;³⁶ nevertheless, the semantic problem is primarily due to the incorrect Latin text of the *Acta*.

However, the Latin translation was guilty of *faux pas* much more serious than just ambiguous terminology. In some cases the text is garbled beyond recognition; in other cases statements are given a diametrically opposite meaning. A particularly glaring example will be given here as an illustration; but this is not the place for a detailed comparison of the Greek text of Nicaea II with the Latin fragments preserved in the LC.³⁷

The LC reprove Constantine of Cyprus for saying "*Suscipio et amplector honorabiliter sanctas et venerandas imaginem secundum servitium adorationis, quod consubstantiali et vivificatrici Trinitati emitto.*"³⁸ The statement as it stands is justly reprehensible: however, in reality Constantine said the very opposite, distinguishing sharply between the veneration of images and the adoration of the Trinity, "δεχόμενος καὶ ἀσπαζόμενος τιμητικῶς τὰς ἁγίας καὶ σεπτὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὴν κατὰ λατρείαν προσκύνησιν μόνῃ τῇ ὑπερουσίῳ καὶ ζωαρχικῇ τριάδι ἀναπέμπω."³⁹

It is clear that the misunderstanding here is entirely due to the garbled Latin translation and the LC's ignorance of the Greek original.

Thus we see that the author was led astray by his poor knowledge of Greek patristic literature, and by his exclusive reliance on the Latin version. But the most important source of error seems to be his very incomplete acquaintance with the proceedings of Nicaea. It appears to be incontrovertible in numerous instances that he is only commenting on an extract from the Latin translation, and does not have access either to the complete quotation or its context.

For instance, when the LC refer to Nicaea's use of the famous eighty-second canon of the Council in Trullo, the ruling is quoted in this form: "*In quibusdam venerabilium imaginis picturae agnus digiti praecursoris monstratus designatur, quod in signum relictus est gratiae, verum nobis per legem praemonstrans agnum, Christum Dominum nostrum.*"⁴⁰ The LC object that the canon is not relevant to the image question. It seems then that the LC had access only to the introductory sentence of the canon, (the whole of which is quoted by Nicaea II), but not the later crucial sentence which says that Christ ought to be pictured in his human character (*kata ton anthrópinon charaktera*) in place of the outmoded image of the Lamb (*anti tou palaiou amnou*).⁴¹ I am certain that if the author of the LC had been aware of this part of the canon, he would not have brushed it aside as not pertaining to images. But it seems that he only had the first sentence of the Nicene reference available to him.

There are even clearer instances, of the use of quotations taken completely out of context. In castigating the reference of the Council to the "Pater" commending a "pictorem"⁴² the LC make the quite preposterous error of taking this allusion to the revered "Father" Asterios of Amasia as referring to God the Father.⁴³ A

blunder of this magnitude would not have been committed by the author of the LC, no matter how poor the Latin translation of the *Acta* may have been, if he had read all of the relevant section. But it seems that he only had the isolated quotation that is embodied in the chapter heading⁴⁴ in front of him, with no knowledge of the context whatsoever.

Exactly the same error is made in another case. The Council approved the opinion of the Church Father Anastasios of Antioch (7th century) that the icon of Christ is comparable to the image of the absent emperor.⁴⁵ The garbled Latin translation gave: "Christi imaginem honorandam sicuti et imaginem imperatoris Pater sensit."⁴⁶ This the LC interpreted as God the Father commanding that pictures of Christ be given the same honor as the emperor's! If the author would have had any inkling of the context of the quotation, he would not have made this gross error of equating the "Pater" with "Deus."

In several places the LC attribute statements to the Council directly, and do not realize that these were in reality taken from the synodical letter of Pope Hadrian to the emperors, which was incorporated in the Council proceedings.⁴⁷ When refusing to admit the example of Pope Silvester erecting statues to Constantine as precedent for image worship, the LC do not take note that this was a papal argument.⁴⁸ The same holds for the LC's disputing the appositeness of certain quotations from Athanasios, Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory of Nyssa.⁴⁹ Again the error is one only of ignorance, not willful distortion; I am convinced that the author of the LC did not know that Hadrian's epistle was incorporated (with a few politic omissions and additions⁵⁰) into the *Acta* of 787.

The LC often attribute responsibility for quotations from authorities to the innocent official reader of these *testimonia*. For instance, the deacon Epiphanius is alleged to be the source of the statue of Jesus and the *hemorrhoids* (taken from Eusebius, of course).⁵¹ Also, the Council of 787, in the person of the reader Gregory, is made responsible for, although in a garbled form, the famous iconoclastic argument that the eucharist is the only legitimate image of Christ.⁵²

We shall give one last example of a quote taken out of context, hence completely misunderstood. Although "Deus in localis sit" Nicaea II is accused of saying "Veneramus et adoramus (images) sicut locum Dei."⁵³ First of all, the LC do not realize that the Council only quotes from Leontios of Neapolis (7th century).

Leontios said that Christians hold Nazareth in veneration because the Savior lived there; they do not esteem the stones, the houses etc. for their own sake, but on account of Christ who sanctified the physical locality by his presence.⁵⁴ The LC are first guilty of taking *locum Dei* to mean *imagines* whereas the quotation shows it to refer to Nazareth; secondly, no account is taken of the context of the whole argument, which aims at showing how physical entities become steppingstones to the Divine, but are not to be placed on the same level. Yet, the author of the LC should not be held responsible for these mistakes. I definitely think that, of this whole section of the *Acta*, all he had available was this isolated quotation: — fatherless and motherless like Melchisedek — “We venerate and adore images as the place of God.”

Such instances could be multiplied at great length. However, I think that these already give at least some support to the hypothesis that the author of the LC only had a *florilegium* of quotations from the *Acta* supplied to him, but not the entire proceedings, either in bad Latin or good Greek. The format of the LC gives further proof of this. The arguments are set forth as isolated *capitula*: a brief extract from the *Acta*, in quotation or paraphrase, is given in the chapter heading, and followed by a refutation in the chapter itself. It seems to me that the author simply adopted the form in which the information was made available; he took the *catena* of extracts supplied to him, commented on each in turn, without reference even to the other extracts, without knowledge of the context, and, in many cases, of the provenance of the opinion refuted.

If this hypothesis is correct, it has certain implications for the correct evaluation of the LC. Judging from what has remained of the first Latin translation of the *Acta*, this version falsified and distorted the meaning of Nicaea II in numerous places. But, further, the author of the LC did not have the benefit of access to the continuous account — which runs several hundred folio pages. It seems that he only knew the brief extracts now embodied in the chapter headings of the LC.⁵⁵ If this is so, then, no matter what philosophical and linguistic barriers existed between East and West, the LC cannot be taken as a response to the Byzantine doctrine of images in any meaningful sense. In some ways, the situation is as if one wrote a book critique only on the basis of a garbled version of the table of contents. However, this conclusion does not detract from the coherence and value of the LC's own

positive attitude to images, the subject to which we shall now turn.

III

In setting forth the LC's own attitude to images, emphasis will be given to those aspects of the problem to which it seems that not enough attention has yet been devoted. There is no need here to duplicate summaries of the LC's doctrine of images already available in the literature.⁵⁶

The LC take their stand on Pope Gregory's commonsense "western" doctrine: images are useful, have historical, didactic value; they should be neither destroyed nor adored.⁵⁷ The LC affirm: "In basilicas sanctorum imagines non ad adorandum sed ad memoriam rerum gestarum et venustatem parietum habere permittimus."⁵⁸ Adoration should only be given to God. Pictures do not have any divine mystery attached to them; they are material objects with no connection to spiritual realities.⁵⁹

The fundamental attitude of the LC is clear. Declining neither to the right nor to the left, the LC declare: "solum Deum adorantes et eius sanctis opportunam venerationem exhibentes, nec cum illis (i.e. the Iconoclasts of 754) frangimus nec cum istis (i.e. the Iconophiles) adoramus."⁶⁰ The political utility of such a stance is obvious; it enables the author to anathematize both Greek factions in the name of a traditional orthodoxy. Nevertheless there are several aspects of his attitude which are not motivated solely by the polemical purposes of the treatise, and deserve closer consideration.

The LC deny any legitimacy to the well-known argument that "imagine honor in primam formam transit."⁶¹ Images are simply material objects. It is clear that the LC have no familiarity whatsoever with the philosophical ideas involved in the Greek doctrines of hypostatic or hierarchical connection between image and prototype. It is also noteworthy that no reference at all is made to the famous Christological reasoning of the Iconoclasts, whereby the maker of an icon of Christ is accused simultaneously of Nestorian and Monophysite error. Of course this is partly intelligible in view of the history of previous western reluctance to get implicated in the subtleties of Greek Christology; but mainly it still indicates a lack of theological sophistication on the part of the LC.⁶² This naivete explains why the LC reject with horror the comparison between the honor paid to images of absent emperors

and the adoration of images of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints.⁶³ Moreover, the LC are again involved in the error of confusing *adoratio* and relative *proskynesis* inciting counterexamples such as the refusal of Paul and Barnabas to accept the superstitious obsequium of the Lycaonians.⁶⁴ Nonetheless, the element of deep spirituality should not be overlooked, nor the genuine concern to preserve the divine transcendence inviolate.

In some ways the refusal to admit images as material helps to religiosity lends a strangely modern, "Protestant" tone to the LC. "Esto, imagines adorare virtus et bonum opus est. Numquid nam fidei aequari potest? . . . Abraham denique non ex operibus, sed ex fide iustificatus est."⁶⁵ The author pours scorn on adducing dreams and visions in favor of images.⁶⁶ He is sceptical of pretended miracles associated with images; in any case there also are lying wonders — doesn't Satan transfigure himself into an angel of light?⁶⁷ The story of Abgar and the picture of Jesus is rejected as being apocryphal and as already condemned in the Gelasian decree.⁶⁸

However this "enlightenment" of the LC is only relative. In accordance with his philosophical materialism, the author grants to relics of saints, or other objects sanctified by their physical contact a veneration which he refuses to images which have only an "ideal" connection with their archetypes:⁶⁹ "honor itaque digne sanctorum corporibus reliquiis sive basilicis exhibitus et omnipotenti Deo et sanctis eius manet acceptus."⁷⁰ Also, when the LC deny the legitimacy of comparing the veneration to be accorded to the divine Scriptures to that given to images, there is a trace of superstitious respect for the magic of the written word. Writing is an inherently superior mode of religious communication. "Non enim ait Paulus apostolus: 'Quaecunque picta sunt, ad nostram doctrinam picta sunt' sed ait 'Quaecunque scripta sunt, ad nostram doctrinam scripta sunt. . .'"⁷¹ However I do not want to press this point unduly; the polemical element is also very obvious in the argument.

In a very interesting "humanistic" manner the LC declare that man, as *opus Dei*, is entitled to higher respect than *imagines manufactas*.⁷² It is more proper to pay reverence to a living man than to insensate images. This is coupled with the usual "spiritual" interpretation of the divine likeness in man. "Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam" is not applicable to material images. Following Ambrose and Augustine, the LC

assert that both image and similitude are incorporeal; the *imago*, consisting of intellect, will, and memory is tripartite like the Holy Trinity; the *similitudo* appears in moral approximation to the divine charity, justice, and goodness.⁷³

The foregoing points bring up an interesting question. The reverence for the written word, an "ethical" theory of similitude consisting in imitation of virtues, preference accorded to physical relics over images also appear in Byzantine iconoclastic thought. There does seem to be an affinity between the LC and iconoclastic views which at least merits a closer look.

There is no need to illustrate again the LC's utter lack of sympathy for the views of Nicaea II. The heretics of 754 are also condemned, but at shorter length and in less bitter terms. One must of course remember that the Iconoclasts were opponents of the ideology of Nicaea II, which would predispose the LC to regard them less severely. There is a trace of this perhaps in the LC's castigation of the "unfilial" action of the miscreants of Nicaea II for declaring the Iconoclasts, their own spiritual parents, heretics.⁷⁴ This is not to say that the LC are indulgent to image-breakers: those who "*incaute loca divinis cultibus mancipata ornamentis exspoliavere*"⁷⁵ are compared in cruelty to the Jews who crucified the Savior. However, the deed of the image-breakers appears in better light than that of the Jews: "*isti enim habuerunt zelum Dei, sed non secundum scientiam, cum imagines penitus abdicaverunt; illis simulantes se habere zelum legis habuerunt zelum livoris et perfidiosissimae iniquitatis, cum Dominum patibulo adfixerunt.*"⁷⁶ Thus, though the hasty actions of the Iconoclasts are deplored, they are still granted, amazingly, to have possessed *zelus Dei*!⁷⁷ In the *horos* of 754 the tone of the objection is worship of idols approximates the deep Augustinian spirituality of the LC. The Iconoclasts declared, in words which could have been used by the LC, that images draw man from the high adoration of God to a lowly material adoration of the creature.⁷⁸ The Iconoclasts exempted at least certain relics from the ban on images, though perhaps with more discrimination than the LC.⁷⁹

The most intriguing resemblance between the LC and Iconoclastic views is the common high regard paid to the Cross. As if in counterpoise to their hatred of anthropomorphic icons, the Iconoclasts exalted both the idea and representations of the Cross.⁸⁰ The Cross retained for them its full ritual value. The

Iconoclasts exorcised demons and sicknesses by the sign of the Cross.⁸¹ They consecrated meals with the sign of the Cross.⁸² In churches they replaced images by plain crucifixes.⁸³ The Cross was for them a token of the triumphant power of the faith, arresting the torrent of error.⁸⁴ The emperors raised high the Cross as the sign of victory.⁸⁵

In the LC we find also an extravagant praise of the Cross, very much akin to the Iconoclast attitude. For the author of the LC, also, the Cross is primarily a sign of the Savior's cosmic triumph, "*Hoc enim vexillo antiquus hostis (i.e. Satan), non imaginibus, victus est. His armis, non colorum fucis, diabolus expugnatus est. Per hanc, non per picturas, inferni claustra destituta sunt.*"⁸⁶ The military symbolism is very much in the foreground. "*Hoc est nostri regis insigne, non quaedam pictura, quod nostri exercitus indesinenter aspiciunt legiones. Hoc est signum nostri imperatoris, non compaginato colorum, quod ad proelium nostrae sequuntur cohortes.*"⁸⁷ The ideological affinity with the faith of the Iconoclastic soldier-emperors seems to be quite apparent. It is not clear however whether this "cross mysticism" of the LC implies some special sanction for representations of the Cross, as opposed to images. Though the LC refer to the *crucis lignum*⁸⁸ yet they roundly declare that "*Non. . . per materiales ab opificibus conditas imagines sed per crucis mysterium. . . superba saeculi et inflata sapientia corrui.*"⁸⁹ Material images are set in contrast to the spiritual mystery of the Cross. Of course it seems obvious that the LC would have at least less a priori objection to the "adoratio" of plain effigies of the Cross, than to worship of anthropomorphic images; yet a cultus of the material crucifix does not seem to be advocated.

Whether or not there is any direct dependence of the LC on Iconoclastic ideas is more problematic. The LC explicitly appeal to St. Paul's cross mysticism.⁹⁰ The Iconoclasts likewise drew some of their inspiration from the Pauline texts.⁹¹ There is no need to catalogue at length the well-known speculations of the early Fathers on the ubiquity of the *forma crucis* in everyday life and Biblical narratives, in the masts of sailing ships and the outstretched arms of Moses.⁹² It should be noted that this early speculation always did focus on the Cross as the *vexillum* of the Risen Savior's triumph, quite unlike the fixation of later medieval mystics on the sufferings and humiliation of the *Jesus patibilis*. Both the LC and Iconoclastic theology perpetuated this primitive emphasis on the all-conquering Cross. However, I think, this is a

case of parallelism rather than direct contact between the LC and Iconoclastic thought.

There is one more possible connection, however. Though the Iconodules of 787 certainly held the "life-giving Cross" in high regard, the exclusive veneration paid to it by the Iconoclasts necessitated at least a seeming deprecation when the images were restored. For instance, Leo III had replaced by a cross the Christ image over the Chalke gate. During Irene's reign the icon was restored. Similar readjustments were made in churches decorated solely with crosses. Thus it is not impossible that confused reports did reach the West of a lack of respect displayed by the new masters of Byzantium toward the Cross; then the polemical aim of the LC would naturally have been well served by an emphasis on the high Frankish regard for the Cross. It is true, however, that the LC do not directly accuse the Iconophiles of condemning the Cross.

IV

We are now perhaps in a better position to discuss the actual attitude of the LC to works of art, as well as the LC's putative influence on contemporary artistic activity.

First of all, as if in compensation for their "low" estimate of the religious value of images in general, the LC impose no restriction on the subject matter or the manner of representation. As long as the image properly serves its didactic and mnemonic purpose, any religious or secular theme is licit. There are no iconographic directions given in the LC, along the lines of Byzantine painters' handbooks. No preference is given to symbolic over realistic depiction.⁹³ No restriction is made about sculpture in the round as against two-dimensional or bas-relief representation. With impartiality as well as considerable familiarity the LC enumerate different methods of manufacturing *objets d'art*.⁹⁴ Then the LC give a detailed catalogue of the corruptibility of various materials: wood burns, wax is discolored, etc.⁹⁵ This is not to be construed against artistic production as such, but only as part of the warning against image worship. By the denial of the "consubstantiality" of image and prototype works of art are removed from the realm of the "numinous."

One can see signs of this attitude in several passages. The LC object to a statement — of course taken completely out of context — from the Acta of 787 which asserts that illustrations do

not contradict but are concordant with Scripture. In refutation, the LC produce a long list of mythological subjects of paintings: Perseus and the Gorgons, Acteon and Diana, Orpheus and Eurydice, etc. — poetical fictions, obviously not found in the Bible. But the LC do not oppose on this account mythological representations; exception is only taken to the supposed Scriptural relevance of all illustrations.⁹⁶ The further statement that Scripture contains many things which cannot be illustrated⁹⁷ is only a comment on the limitations of pictorial art, not on its perversity. The LC also point out that it is easy to mistake for the image of the Virgin with Jesus any other picture of a woman with a child — say Sara with Isaac, Rebecca with Jacob, even Venus with Aeneas, etc. But again only those who ignorantly “adore” the image are reproved; the picture as such is morally neutral.⁹⁸

Other comments of the LC are in line with this “de-sacralized” concept of art. Natural talent and experience, not divine *afflatus* are the sources of the artist’s skill.⁹⁹ The artist, as any other craftsman, must learn his trade. In fact, the LC assimilate the art of painting to other occupations to a degree with which present-day art critics would be, I think, somewhat uncomfortable.¹⁰⁰ The LC point out the absurdity of making the religious value of an image in any way dependent on its costliness or execution.¹⁰¹ Christianity then becomes exclusively the religion of the rich.

As was already noted, the casual mention in the LC of allegorical representations and classical subjects does not seem to make the LC’s connection with the Ripon “mappemonde” very compelling.¹⁰² The same holds for linking the LC’s passing references to textiles with the oriental fabrics in Theodulf’s Bible.¹⁰³ (These fabrics protected the pages written in silver and gold). The selective iconography which Schnitzler detects in the Court School productions of 790-800 seems to be neither certain nor very relevant.¹⁰⁴ However, by contrast, the mosaic of Germigny-des-Prés¹⁰⁵ does seem to present very real affinities with certain passages from the LC, which discuss the role of the Mosaic Tabernacle and the First Temple in the image argument.¹⁰⁶ To this then we shall turn.

The LC deny the legitimacy of using the Tabernacle, invoked by Nicaea II, as a precedent for the *adoratio* of religious images. When Moses was told to construct a *propitiatorium* and the *arca testamenti*, he neither broke the stone tablets nor commanded their adoration. All these objects were the prefigurations of

spiritual mysteries.¹⁰⁷ In particular the two cherubim stand for the Law and the Gospel, guarding the mercy-seat which represents *misericordia Dei*. Besaleel, the builder of the Tabernacle, prefigured Christ; hence it is not proper to appeal to his example for making images.¹⁰⁸ Moses worked under direct divine guidance when furnishing the Tabernacle; he was the Lawgiver, a holy man, and his work foreshadowed future mysteries. None of these things are applicable to the mundane products of the present-day artificer.¹⁰⁹ The LC also deny that the leones and boves Solomon put in his Temple are precedents for image worship. These sculpted figures were arcane mysteries: the LC quote an allegorical interpretation from Gregory the Great, according to which they signify that pastors of the Church should be like oxen in humility, but ferocious as lions against sin.¹¹⁰

Two things should immediately be noticed. The LC discuss the Tabernacle and the Temple at some length because of the importance attributed to these in the pro-image arguments of Nicaea II. In fact it is apparent that the highly spiritualizing and typological interpretations that the LC espouse indicate a certain embarrassment with the literal meaning. Secondly, the LC does not in particular sanction representations of the Tabernacle: a work of divine craftsmanship, its furnishings were transfigured by the presence of superhuman numen ("radiant mysteriis et rutilant sacramentis"¹¹¹). At any rate, the LC do not exempt pictures of the Tabernacle from their version of the "image tabu"; rather, the unique nature of the original is stressed.

However, as we saw, the LC do not impose iconographic restrictions on art; the Tabernacle was as legitimate to depict as any other religious subject. In fact there is an extraordinarily interesting connection of the LC with the iconography of the Germigny mosaic.

The mosaic represents the Ark with two small sculptured cherubim, overshadowed by two much larger ones. All four angels are shown as two-winged anthropomorphic beings. The Divine Presence in the mercy seat is indicated by the well-known symbol of the *Dextera Dei* coming out from a cloud. There is evidence for floral decorations most of which were obliterated in the nineteenth-century restorations.¹¹² Apparently before the restoration there were also fragments of more conventional six-winged cherubim in the vault in front of the apse.¹¹³ The dedicatory inscription indicates that Theodulf himself commissioned the

mosaic.¹¹⁴

The use of the Ark of the Covenant at Germigny in the position of the central "cult image" is unique in early Jewish and Christian art. Of course the Ark does occur in narrative sequences as in the Dura synagogue and S. Maria Maggiore. But there is no immediate parallel.¹¹⁵

In early Christian iconography cherubim are usually either the six-winged anthropomorphic or the four-winged theromorphic beings of the Isaiah and Ezekiel theophanies.¹¹⁶ Though the two-winged representations at Germigny have parallels,¹¹⁷ they can be easily understood as merely following the description of the cherubim in the biblical accounts of the Tabernacle and the Solomonic Temple.¹¹⁸ The interesting and difficult question is the number of the angels. It has been suggested, with little plausibility, that the artist, for some reason, quadrupled his one available model.¹¹⁹ The Mosaic Tabernacle had only two cherubim; the accounts of Solomon's Temple also only mention two. The solution to this iconographic difficulty seems to be offered by a patristic text incorporated in the LC. A long extract is taken almost *verbatim* from Bede's *De Templo Solomonis*.¹²⁰ The two smaller angels are part of the original furnishing of the Mosaic Tabernacle; the large cherubim, added by Solomon, symbolize the spread of the gospel to the Gentiles. Now, since the text is from Bede, it does not necessarily follow that the mosaic is dependent on the LC, but it could have been directly inspired by the passage from Bede. But the fact still holds that this mosaic is a unique representation, slightly post-dating the LC. There is certainly nothing comparable to it in Anglo-Saxon or Merovingian art. However, the possibility of an independent discovery by Theodulf of a seemingly very natural exegetical conflation of the two Scriptural descriptions should not be ruled out. Also, Theodulf could have known the passage from Bede even if he had nothing to do with the preparation of the LC. But it is difficult to resist the conclusion that there is an intimate connection between the description in the LC and the mosaic.¹²¹

There is one puzzling aspect to the iconography of the mosaic. The small cherubim are represented, quite properly, as golden statuettes. According to the biblical text the large wooden cherubim of Solomon's Temple were also gold-coated. But no such impression is given by the mosaic; the large cherubim are shown as animated beings or, at most, as very life-like multi-

colored effigies. Certainly no effort is made to depict them as obviously inanimate statues.¹²²

The conjecture that Theodulf conceived the building as a new Solomonic Temple, with the apse mosaic standing for the Sanctuary, has much plausibility, but its implications should not be pressed too far. Theodulf's Oratory was a private building, with no public propaganda function.¹²³ In particular, no connection can be made with the LC in this respect. There is no glorification in the LC of Charles as the new David or Solomon.

V

The results of the foregoing investigations will now be briefly summarized. The LC were expressly written to refute the Council of 787. The deliberations of the Council were available to the author of the LC only in the form of a set of extracts, taken from a garbled Latin translation of the Greek original. Not only did the translation falsify or confuse key concepts, but the extracts were so brief and lacking in context that the author of the LC can be said to have had no real knowledge of the proceedings of Nicaea II. The LC espouse a strictly materialistic solution of the image-prototype problem, coupled with a "de-sacralized" valuation of the didactic and mnemonic purpose of visual art. The LC show little comprehension of, or sympathy for, a philosophical, "Platonic" theory of image worship. Affinities can be noted between certain aspects of the LC's ideology and Iconoclastic thought, especially with respect to the triumphal, cosmic significance of the Cross. Images must not be adored; but the LC impose no iconographic restrictions on art, since all visual representation falls outside the domains of both the sacred and the diabolic. The LC show familiarity with the varieties and techniques of artistic production. A close relation can be discerned between the peculiar iconography of the apse mosaic at Germigny-des-Prés, and the LC's description of the Sanctuary in the Solomonic Temple. Otherwise the LC seem to have had little direct effect on contemporary artistic activity.¹²⁴

BROWN UNIVERSITY

*I am deeply grateful to Prof. Ernst Kitzinger for his help and advice during the preparation of this paper; but, of course, he is not responsible for any of its shortcomings

FOOTNOTES

1. The political repercussions were, of course, manifold. (See e.g. F. Masai, "La politique des Isauriens et la naissance de l'Europe" *Byzantion*, 33 (1963), pp. 191-221.) But this is not the place to discuss at length the history of the iconoclastic movements of the eighth and ninth centuries. The first phase, during the reigns of Leo III and Constantine V, ended with the restoration of images, under Constantine VI and Irene, by the Second Council of Nicaea (787). We are here neither concerned with the second outbreak of Iconoclasm and the Council of 815, nor with the reaffirmation of a moderate position akin to that of the *Libri Carolini* by the Council of Paris (825). See E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London, n.d.), esp. pp. 73-84 and pp. 222-73, for a rapid survey of the period, G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, revised edition, (London, 1969), pp. 147-209, esp. pp. 182-86, "Byzantium and Charles the Great", C. J. Hefele — H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, III/2 (Paris, 1910), pp. 601-804, 1061-91; K. Schwartzlose, *Der Bilderstreit, ein Kampf der griechischen Kirche um ihre Eigenart und um ihre Freiheit* (Gotha, 1890), *passim*, (does not discuss the West). See also my recent monograph, *Byzantine Iconoclasm During the Reign of Leo III, with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources* (Louvain, 1973). (Henceforth abbreviated BI)
2. Some specialized literature on the western attitude to images. *Das Gottesbild im Abendland*, hrsg. von G. Howe (Witten u. Berlin, 1957), esp. ch. 1, W. Schöne, "Die Bildgeschichte der christlichen Gottesgestalten in der abendländischen Kunst", pp. 7-56 and ch. 4, J. Kollwitz, "Bild und Bildertheologie im Mittelalter", pp. 109-38, G. Ostrogorsky, "Rom und Byzanz im Kampf um die Bilderverehrung", *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, 6 (1933), pp. 73-87, G. Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunstlehren der byzantinischen und abendländischen Theologie," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 50 (1931), pp. 1-23. See in particular the important work of G. Haendler, *Epochen karolingischer Theologie: Eine Untersuchung über die karolingischen Gutachten zum byzantinischen Bilderstreit* (Berlin, 1958), and W. Delius, *Die Bilderfrage im Karolingerreich* (Halle, 1928). C. Papadopoulos, *Ἡ Εἰκονομαχία ἐν τῇ Δύσει*. [The fight against images in the West] (Alexandria, 1921) is a popular treatment of no independent scholarly value, but one which enters into the spirit as well as the letter of the medieval documents. The recent book of W. Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London, 1969) does discuss in passing the *Libri Carolini* but does not bring forth any new insights as far as the image question is concerned. See also E. Ewig in *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. III (Freiburg, 1966), pp. 91-95.
3. Henceforth abbreviated LC.
4. Henceforth referred to as Nicaea II.
5. The details as worked out by W. von den Steinen, "Entstehungs-

- geschichte der Libri Carolini" *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 21 (1929-30), pp. 1-93 have in general been accepted in the most recent investigations of Wallach and Freeman.
6. J.D. Mansi, *Concilia*, (vols. XII and XIII) has the Greek text and the ninth-century Latin translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius.
 7. Mansi XIII, 759-810, reprinted in PL 98, 1247C-1292.
 8. According to H. Bastgen, "Das *Capitulare* Karls des Grossen oder die sog. *Libri Carolini*", *Neues Archiv des Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 37 (1912), p. 477, the LC and the *Capitulare* were identical; Hampe, in his edition of Hadrian's writings (M.G.H. *Epp* V, 5) takes the *Capitulare* to have been the *Grundlage* of the LC. For our purposes here these questions of priority are peripheral. However, the LC definitely contain material that was not subjected to papal inspection. See footnote 49.
 9. Hincmar of Rheims, PL 126, 360 "De cuius destructione [sc. the Council of Nicaea] non modicum volumen, quod in palatio adolescentulus legi, ab eodem imperatore Romam est per quosdam episcopos missum" Hincmar then quotes *verbatim* from chapter 28 of LC, Book IV. Maybe this presentation volume was an illuminated MS? The Arsenal and Vatican codices have no illustrations, but of course these were not prepared for the pope himself.
 10. For details of the history and description of the MSS. see Bastgen, *op. cit.*; pp 15-51 and pp 453-533. There is a good summary, based on Bastgen, of these matters in A. Freeman, "Theodulf of Orleans and the *Libri Carolini*" *Speculum*, 32 (1957), pp. 665-70
 11. The LC will be quoted by book and chapter from H. Bastgen's edition in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia* t. II, *Supplementum* (Hanover and Leipzig, 1924). Page and line numbers from Bastgen are given in brackets. Bastgen's version, though the best available at present, is based on a still inadequate collation of the Vatican MS. (See A. Freeman, "Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini*" *Speculum*, 40 (1965), pp. 287-89 for the latest list of emendations). L. Wallach has promised a new edition of the LC ("The *Libri Carolini* and Patristics, Latin and Greek Prolegomena to a Critical Edition" in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. L. Wallach (Ithaca, 1966), p. 498.) Wallach gives references to earlier emendations of Bastgen's text made by von den Steinen, de Bruyne, and himself. (p. 451). The other easily accessible printed edition in Migne, PL 98, 941-1248B reproduces M. Goldast's 1608 version, which of course is based only on the Arsenal MS
 12. Reference to the finding, still unpublished to my knowledge, is made by A. Freeman, *Speculum*, 40, p. 219. Miss Freeman points out that the new discovery has adverse connotations for Wallach's thesis that the LC had no significant dissemination.
 13. Title (Bastgen, 1, 2-3) "Incipit opus illustrissimū et excellentissimū seu spectabilis viri Caroli, nutu Dei regis Francorum" etc. The marginal notes in the Vatican MS have been attributed to Charles by von den

Steinen (*Neues Archiv*, 49 (1930-31) pp. 207-80). This identification has now been rejected by H. Fichtenau, "Karl der Grosse und das Kaisertum" *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 61 (1953) pp. 280-87. According to Fichtenau the notes may have even been written in the ninth century.

14. In particular, at great length by Bastgen, the latest editor of the LC, in *Neues Archiv* 37, pp. 491-533. A. Kleinclausz in an almost equally detailed fashion refutes Bastgen's arguments (*Alcuin*, Paris, 1948), Appendice "Alcuin et la question des images," pp. 300-05) Cf. Wallach's review in *Speculum*, 24 (1949), pp. 587-90. There is no need to give the stylistic and historical particulars here. Kleinclausz concludes (p. 305) "Certes, il serait interessant d'en connaître l'auteur, et si celui-ci était Alcuin, ce serait un nouveau fleuron ajouté à sa couronne de gloire, mais il faut se résigner pour l'instant à n'en rien savoir." The latest proponent of the "Alcuinian" hypothesis, Wallach, only maintains that Alcuin had a hand in the final editorial work, but says that "it seems advisable to abandon the presupposition, for a long time shared by historians, that the search for the author of the LC must be made only among the men surrounding the Frankish king. I am now inclined to look for the elusive author also among other theologians of the Carolingian age. ("The Unknown Author of the *Libri Carolini*: Patristic Exegesis, Mozarabic Antiphons and the *Vetus Latina*" in *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of A. M. Albereda*, ed. S. Prete (New York, 1961), p. 514). This statement marks, in my opinion, an undesirable retrogression, for — whoever the author of the LC was — the ideas certainly reflect the official position of the Frankish court under Charles and Louis the Pious, a position well documented in the pronouncements of the Councils of Frankfurt and Paris.
15. The case for Theodulf's authorship has been very strongly argued by A. Freeman in the two articles in *Speculum* vols. 32 and 40, already cited. Wallach energetically and at great length attacks Miss Freeman's views, especially in his articles in the two *Festschriften* already cited in footnotes 11 and 14.
16. G. Manz, "Ausdruckformen der lateinischen Liturgiesprache bis ins elfte Jahrhundert," *Texte und Arbeiten* I, 1 ed. Erzabtei Beuron, 1941, pp. 36-42.
17. See Hauch-Herzog, *Realenzyklopädie*², (1902), Band X, p. 96: L. Kurz, *Gregors des Grossen Lehre von den Engel* (Rottenburg, 1938); W. Schulz, *Der Einfluss Augustins in der Theologie und Christologie des 8./9. Jahrhunderts* (Halle, 1913). Händler (op. cit. pp. 96-99) points out some interesting deviations in the LC from Augustinian Christology.
18. III 13 (Bastgen 110, 35-36) "Ex Patre enim et Filio Spiritum Sanctum non ex Patre per Filium Sanctum procedere recte creditur." This is followed by a battery of quite irrelevant Scriptural texts.
19. III 5 (Bastgen, 115).
20. III 1 (Bastgen, 106-08).
21. "quod rex eorum Constantinus eas ab idolis liberasset. . ." *Praefatio* (Bastgen 3, 26).

22. Quoting from the translation of a supposed imperial letter to Hadrian "Per eum qui conregnat nobis Deus" (II, Bastgen 8-12). The objection stems from the LC's lack of familiarity with stereotyped expressions of Byzantine court etiquette, coupled with the determination to find the Greeks in the wrong. (The same holds for the LC's rejection of **divalia** to characterize imperial missives (I3 [Bastgen 14, 37]). Actually the expression read ὁ δὲ πάντων ἡμῶν σωτὴρ καὶ συμβασιλεύων ὑμῖν (sc. omnium nostrum salvator qui **vobis conregnat**) Mansi XIII, 407-8. The words were addressed by the Council to the sovereigns, not by the latter to the Pope.
23. III 13 Cap. (Bastgen, 127, 25-26) "Quia mulier in synodo docere non debet, sicut Herena in eorum fecisse legitur." This is supported with an ample battery of — this time quite relevant — texts from the Pauline epistles.
24. III 13 (Bastgen, 127, 31-32) "Non enim eam sexus fragilitas sive animi mobilitas doctrinae sive praelationis super viros apicem tenere permittit. . ."
25. III 18 (Bastgen, 142, 14-15), II 12 (Bastgen 72, 31), III 2 (Bastgen 123, 26).
26. Though it would have been politic for them to request Frankish participation, one can understand that the theologians of Nicaea II simply gave no thought to the approbation of the northern barbarians. On the other hand, the need to secure papal representatives, to ensure ecumenicity, was an important matter to the Council. Handler (*op. cit.* pp. 38-39), following Hans Baron, views the non-participation of the Franks as less important than other criteria of "universality" which, according to the LC, Nicaea II failed to meet.
27. e.g. Martin, *op. cit.* p. 251. There is no internal evidence to support the late report of the Northumbrian Annals that Charles received the **Acta** directly from Constantinople (**M.G.H. Scriptores**, XIII, p 155).
28. e.g. **Praefatio** (Bastgen, 5, 2-3) "Cuius scripturae textus eloquentia sensuque carens ad nos usque pervenit", II 18 (Bastgen, 77, 14-15) "...cum pene nullum habeat Latinae integritatis vigorem sensuque sit tepidus verbisque inlepidus et quadam ex parte ratione nudatus. . ." That the translation was faulty to the point of being unintelligible was recognized by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who produced the extant Latin version (Mansi, XII, 981D).
29. II 17 (Bastgen, 76, 40-41). See *infra*, footnote 49.
30. IV 5 (Bastgen, 179-84).
31. A surprising statement, in view of the renown enjoyed by Simeon at Rome, and the popularity there of the Saint's medallions. Cf. K. Holl, "Der Anteil der Styliten am Aufkommen der Bilderverehrung" in **Ges. Aufsätze**, 2 (Tübingen, 1928), p. 388 ff. Ullmann views these gaps in the patristic training of Charles' theologians in a rather strange light. "Throughout the **Libri** there is a studied emphasis on the fundamental divergencies between Orient and Occident and therefore the constant recurrence to the Latin codices and the **Latina bibliotheca** in order to verify a point or a theme." (*op. cit.* p. 141). He then solemnly notes

- "The perusal of the **Latin** codices shows in fact what a *remarkable amount* of early Christian and patristic literature was available and with what eagerness these court theologians threw themselves into the battle with their Byzantine colleagues and the imperial government" (*ibid.* *Italics mine*). These eager court theologians, in spite of their "youthful, dynamic and talented virility" unfortunately did not possess the Greek fire in their impassioned battle with the Byzantines.
32. II 14 (Bastgen, 73-74).
 33. II 19 (Bastgen, 77-79).
 34. II 20 (Bastgen, 79-80).
 35. See e.g. *Das Gottesbild im Abendland*, p. 111.
 36. In his *Responsio*, Hadrian says our predecessors "*adorare atque venerari imagines statuerunt*" PL 98, 1275C. Obviously *adorare* does not have here the sense of worship paid to the Deity.
 37. See e.g. L. Wallach, "The Greek and Latin Versions of II Nicaea and the Synodica of Hadrian I (JE 2448)" *Traditio*, 22 (1966), pp. 103-25, which deals with the textual transmission of Hadrian's letter that was incorporated into the Acts of Nicaea II, as well as with selected patristic texts. See also Wallach's other articles, already cited.
 38. III 17 (Bastgen, 138, 20-23).
 39. Mansi, XIII, 147.
 40. II 17 (Bastgen, 77, 10-13). The LC mistakenly attribute the canon to the sixth Ecumenical Council (following the error in the original proceedings, Mansi, XIII 40E). For the text of the Trullo Canon, see Mansi XI, 978 or G. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Syntagma ton theion kai Hieron Kanonon* (Athens, 1852-59), II, p. 492.
 41. Mansi, XIII, 41A.
 42. III 22 (Bastgen, 148-50).
 43. Mansi, XIII, 15.
 44. III 22 (Bastgen, 148, 15-19) "*Quod iudices qui in praefata synodo fuerunt, insolenter et incongrue artem pictoriam extollere conati sunt dicentes: 'Pia enim est ars pictoris et non recte eam quidam insipienter detrahunt; ipse enim Pater pictorem pie agentem commendat'*"
 45. Mansi, XIII, 57.
 46. III 29 (Bastgen, 166, 10-11).
 47. See Wallach's work in *Traditio*, 22, cited in footnote 37 for a discussion of this synodical letter.
 48. II 13 (Bastgen, 73, 10-11).
 49. II 14-17 (Bastgen, 73-77). It is noteworthy that these chapters have no trace in the *Responsio* of Hadrian to Charles, hence were not included in the original list of objections sent to the Pope. It seems certain that if they had been included, the Pope would have enlightened Charles on their provenance.
 50. Suppressing Hadrian's criticism of the layman Tarasius' irregular election as Patriarch. See Wallach, *Traditio*, 22, p. 109. For the addition of "Christological" arguments see Ostrogorsky's article cited in note 2.

51. IV 15 (Bastgen, 200-02); Eusebius, EH VII 18.
52. IV 14 (Bastgen, 198-200).
53. IV 27 (Bastgen, 161, 17-18).
54. Mansi, XIII, 45B.
55. This is not to say that he did not have a certain amount of additional information about the Council. E.g. the LC condemn the irregular election of Tarasios. III 2 (Bastgen 108-110).
56. See e.g. F. F. Leitschuh, *Geschichte der karolingischen Malerei*, (Berlin, 1894), pp. 9-31; Händler, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-101, Delius, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-27; Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-49; Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 1068-79; H. Schade, "Die Libri Carolini und ihre Stellung zum Bild", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LXXIX (1957), pp. 71-75.
57. See the extracts from Gregory given by Kollwitz in *Das Gottesbild im Abendland*, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
58. III 16 (Bastgen 138, 2-4); cf. *Praefatio* (Bastgen 6, 1-2) "imagines in ornamentis ecclesiarum et memoriae rerum gestarum habentes, et solum Deum adorantes. . ."
59. V. Grumel gives a succinct statement of the western "materialism" vis-à-vis images (D.T.C. VII/1 (Paris, 1927), Art. *Images*, col. 783) "la pensée occidentale se porte d'abord et principalement en tant que similitude. D'où il suit que si l'on vénère l'image, la vénération se porte directement sur l'image en tant que chose. Or, l'image en tant que chose ne mérite pas aucune vénération. . . Ce n'est que plus tard, sous l'influence des doctrines aristotéliciennes que l'on s'élèvera jusqu'à la conception formelle." But Händler correctly emphasizes the intimate connection between the LC's rejection of images and a very poignant "Christusfrömmigkeit."
60. *Praefatio* (Bastgen, 6, 2-4).
61. III 16 (Bastgen, 136, 28-29).
62. A. Harnack asserts that in the East image worship became important because it grew out of Christology; in the West pictures were only a part of the system of "intercessors and helpers in need". I think Harnack mistakes for the genesis of a practice its later theological ramifications. There is no need to invoke Christological arguments to motivate the renewed self-assertion of the visual element in Byzantine-Hellenistic culture. (*History of Dogma*, ET, vol. 5, part II, p. 308.)
63. III 15 (Bastgen, 133-36).
64. III 15 (Bastgen, 137, 21). Händler's argument, that *proskynesis* = *adoratio* is philologically sound, is not entirely convincing; but he is, right to point out that this identification was not the sole basis of the Frankish opposition (*op. cit.*, pp. 68-73).
65. III 17 (Bastgen, 140, 7-10). Just as a matter of interest, Calvin refers to the LC in the *Institutes* (Book I, ch. XI, 14-15). The polemical use made of the LC by Protestant controversialists led to the placing of the work on the *Index*, until 1900.
66. III 26 (Bastgen, 158-61).
67. III 25 (Bastgen, 153-55).

68. IV 10 (Bastgen, 189).
69. III 24 (Bastgen, 153-55).
70. III 16 (Bastgen, 137, 11-13).
71. II 30 (Bastgen, 93, 1-3).
72. II 24 (Bastgen, 83).
73. I 7 (Bastgen, 22-25). It is interesting that here, as in other cases (e.g. in discussing the paradigmatic validity of the Tabernacle and the First Temple) the LC opt for a purely spiritual or typological interpretation; but again this is in large part dictated by the embarrassment of the literal meaning. But when the text is favorable, the LC press the literal meaning to the point of being pedestrian. The exegetical method is subordinated to the needs of polemic. It would not be to our purpose to digress further on the exegetical problems of the LC, and the very real difficulties introduced by the fact that for the LC the **Hebraica veritas** of the Vulgate is normative, whereas Nicaea II based itself on LXX readings. (See e.g. I 12 (Bastgen 31), I 14 (Bastgen 33-34)). In the exegesis there is always the fatal confusion of **adoratio** and **proskynesis**. See G. B. Ladner, *In Imaginem Dei, The Image of Man in Medieval Art* (Latrobe, Penna., 1965) for various patristic and medieval interpretations of the **imago** of Gen. 1:26.
74. The LC use rather strange arguments, with texts such as "Non reveles turpitudinem patris tui" (Lev, 18:7) and "Filii, obedite parentibus vestris" (Eph. 6:1) II 31 (Bastgen 100-102).
75. I 28 (Bastgen, 56, 22-23).
76. I 27 (Bastgen, 56, 1-5).
77. One should remember also the later contacts between the Iconoclasts of the second period and Louis the Pious (Letter of Michael II to Louis, Mansi XIV, 417 ff.); the Council of Paris (825) in a way acted as a mediator to make rapprochement possible between the West and the moderate Iconoclasts. But of course this has only indirect bearing on the LC.
78. Mansi, XIII, 229 E.
79. III 16 (Bastgen, 137, 11-12) "Honor itaque digne sanctorum corporibus, reliquis sive basilicis exhibitus et omnipotenti Deo et sanctis eius manet acceptus". The **horos** of 754 does not mention relics. But in 753 Constantine V ordered his subjects to renounce images by swearing on the Eucharist, the relics of the True Cross and the Gospel Book. (Vita S. Stephani, PG 100, 1112). In general, one must distinguish between the advanced personal scepticism and "anti-clericalism" of the Emperor Constantine, and the more restrained approach of his ecclesiastical supporters. Theophanes (A. M. 6258) reports that the Emperor proscribed prayers to the Virgin and the saints, and destroyed their relics (*Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883) vol. 1, p. 439). Whether or not Theophanes can be trusted on this point, the Council of 754 at any rate had a very high estimate of the Theotokos and the saints, and forbade wanton spoilage of churches on the pretext of the removal of images. (But see A. Frolov, *La relique de la Vraie Croix*, (Paris, 1961), p. 120, note 1.)

I hope to discuss this whole question in detail in a forthcoming work on "Constantinian" Iconoclasm.

80. The only special treatment devoted to this important point is, to my knowledge, G. Millet's "Les Iconoclastes et la Croix a propos d'une inscription de Cappadoce," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 34 (1910) pp. 96-109. A. Grabar of course mentions the Iconoclastic Chalce inscription in *L'iconoclasm byzantin: Dossier archéologique* (Paris, 1957), pp. 134-35, see Frolow, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-27, and Frolow, "Le Christ de la Chalce" *Byzantion* 33 (1963), p. 118. See also BI, ch. X, "The Iconoclastic Iambic Poems."
81. Theodore of Studios, PG, 99, 496A.
82. PG, 99, 1543D τὰ πρὸς αὐτῶν σφραγιζόμενα βρώματα.
83. PG, 99, 437A Ἴδοῦ γὰρ αὐτὸν οἱ μέγιστοι δέσποται
 Ὡς νικοποιοῦν ἐγχαράττουσιν τύπον
 (From an Iconoclastic poem). See P. A. Underwood "The Evidence of Restoration in the Sanctuary Mosaics of the Church of the Dormition in Nicaea" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 13 (1959), pp. 135-143. This article shows that the Iconoclasts replaced with a monumental cross the Madonna in the apse mosaic, in the ninth century the iconophiles in turn removed the cross and restored the Virgin. (The Church of the Dormition was destroyed in the Greco-Turkish war of 1922, but there are good photographs of the mosaic.) The cross in the extant apse decoration of St. Irene in Constantinople comes also from the Iconoclastic period. (D. Talbot Rice, *Byzantine Art* (London, 1962), p. 92, Underwood, *op. cit.*, plate 11).
84. PG, 99, 437B Ῥεῦμα κραταῖδον σταυρὸς ἔστησε πλάνης .
 (From an Iconoclastic poem).
85. PG, 99 435B οἱ φοροῦντες τὰ στέφη/
 Ὑποῦσιν φαιδρῶς Σταυρὸν εὐσεβεῖ κρίσει
 (also from an Iconoclastic poem). It should be noted that Cyril Mango dates all these iambics — I think wrongly — as coming from the second Iconoclastic period. (*The Brazen House: A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 122-24). See W. Wolska-Conus, "De quibusdam Ignatius", *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970), pp. 351-357, and BI, p. 117, note 17.
86. II 28 (Bastgen 89, 29-31).
87. II 28 (Bastgen, 89, 33-36). See also lines 37-44.
88. II 28 (Bastgen, 89, 44).
89. II 28 (Bastgen, 90, 4-6).
90. II 28 (Bastgen, 90, 9-18) I Tim. 2:7; Gal. 6:14; Gal. 2:19-20; Eph. 3:18. It should be noted that these texts are taken via a long quotation from Isodore.
91. In PG, 99, 435D the acrostic reads Ἰγνατίῳ καύχημα ἔννοεῖν σταυρὸν; in 437B, Στεφάνῳ καύχημα σταυρὸν ἔννοεῖν. Both echo Gal. 6:14· ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι ἐφ' μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου κτλ.
92. See e.g. A. Grillmeier, *Der Logos am Kreuz*, (München, 1956), pp. 67-96. This work is most valuable for the detailed evidence it gathers

- together, though its main thesis is open to serious doubt. See also H. Koch, *Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen* (Göttingen, 1917), pp. 47-57.
93. Handler (*op. cit.*, pp. 139-50) gives a cursory and rather unsatisfactory treatment of the art-historical aspects of the LC. The absence of directives on iconography in the LC makes H. Schnitzler's otherwise interesting articles ("Das Kuppelmosaik der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," *Aachener Kunstblätter*, Sonderdruck aus Heft 29/1965) somewhat irrelevant for our purposes. Briefly, Schnitzler attempts to show, on the basis of illuminated MSS and ivories, that in the last decade of the eighth century the *Hofschule* refrained from producing frontal representations of Christ or narrative scenes from his life (as distinguished from the evangelist portraits). Since the LC make no distinction between the permissibility of images of Christ and of saints, it is difficult to make a connection of the LC with Schnitzler's thesis. Moreover, this thesis, though most ingenious, does depend on the quite precise dating of MSS whereof only the relative chronology is certain. Schnitzler's second hypothesis, that in Carolingian times the central mosaic in the dome of the court chapel was a Lamb rather than a *Majestas* figure, is even more conjectural, and does not seem to be capable of complete verification with the available evidence. At any rate, it should again be noted that such symbolic representations are not given preference over anthropomorphic ones in the LC. Händler rightly cautions that the paucity of surviving art objects from this period makes any correlation with the written sources difficult (*op. cit.*, p. 144).
 94. I 2 (Bastgen, 13, 41-43) "quaedam sunt colorum fucis conpaginatae, quaedam auro argentove conflatae quaedam in ligno caelatoris scalpello figuratae. . . quaedam in gypso vel testa formatae" (painting using colors, gold and silver work, carved wood, sculptured marble, lime and brick work). See also III 30 (Bastgen 167, 3); IV 19 (Bastgen, 209, 24).
 95. I 2 (Bastgen, 14, 12-19).
 96. III 23 (Bastgen, 150-53). This was already pointed out by Miss Freeman, *Speculum*, 32, p. 701.
 97. III 23 (Bastgen, 153, 6-7). How does one paint the command "Audi Israel Dominus Deus tuus, Deus unus est"?
 98. IV 21 (Bastgen, 213). I don't think the author is referring to actual pictures he has seen, he only parades his knowledge of biblical and classical lore. The question of Theodulf's connection with the LC on the strength of his classical training and predilection for symbolic and allegorical representation does not concern us at this point. But Miss Freeman's linking of the LC and the Ripon "mappemonde" (inscribed with Theodulf's verses) because both set forth certain common allegorical representations is not entirely convincing. (*Speculum*, 32, pp. 702-03).
 99. I 16 (Bastgen, 39, 41-42); II 27 (Bastgen, 88, 44).
 100. III 22 (Bastgen, 149, 28-30) "Quid enim ars pictorum amplius habet pietatis arte fabrorum, sculptorum, conflatorum, caelatorum, latomorum, lignariorum, terrae cultorum vel ceterorum opificum?" The art of

the painter is on the same level as that of the farmer and the wood-cutter. (Of course, this is a polemical remark, designed to refute the assertion that painting is an *ars pia*).

101. IV 27 (Bastgen, 225-26). I do not think Nicaea II used this argument anywhere. In fact it would be inconsistent with the doctrine that the adoration ascends through the image to the prototype.
102. See above, footnote 98.
103. Freeman, *Speculum* 32, p. 698. For a description of these fabrics see R. Pfister, "Les tissus orientaux de la Bible de Theodulf" in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Boston, 1950), pp. 501-30.
104. See above, footnote 93.
105. The latest discussion of this work is P. Bloch's "Das Apsismosaik von Germigny-des-Prés" in *Karl der Grosse, Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, hrsg. von W. Braunfels und H. Schnitzler, Band III, *Karolingische Kunst* (Düsseldorf, 1965), pp. 234-62. There are good color reproductions of the mosaic in J. Hubert et al., *L'Empire Carolingien* (Paris, 1968) p. 12 f.
106. It should be noted that Schade, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-78 does not even refer to the Germigny mosaic when he decides that the LC had no influence on contemporary works of art. His references to the evangelist portraits as illicit "symbolic" figures and the "impious" martial scenes of the Utrecht psalter (p. 77) as contrary to the injunctions of the LC, seem to be based on mistaken inferences from the text. The LC do **not** restrict the range of subjects for artists, as we already said. See Delius, *op. cit.*, p. 23. More generally, Schade does not seem to show much familiarity with the work of art historians on the subject, the same appears to be true of Wallach in his rather off-hand dismissal of the relevance of Carolingian art to the LC (Wallach in *Didascalie*, p. 512). Wallach depends on the authority of Schade, in a somewhat one-sided manner, when opting for "no influence."
107. I 15 (Bastgen 34-37). The LC follow Augustine's allegorical interpretation. They reproduce Augustine's rather complicated interpretation of the two sets of stone tablets in Exodus 32-34. The first pair (broken by Moses when he became angry at the apostasy of his people) were written by the **finger of God** and represent the Old Covenant, difficult to fulfill, the second pair of tablets, written by Moses under divine inspiration (Ex. 34 27), have a **human** quality, and represent the New Testament, easier to fulfill. I am not as certain as Miss Freeman (*Speculum* 32, pp. 692-693) that this somehow indicates a Hebraistic leaning (of Theodulf?) for the superior inspiration of the O.T. Miss Freeman also points to the preponderance of O.T. prooftexts in the LC. I think this is dictated solely by the exigencies of the argument the O.T. is replete with strictures against actual idolatry, whereas in the N.T. this problem is somewhat peripheral.
108. I 16 (Bastgen, 37-39) Cf. Mansi, XIII, 250.
109. II 26 (Bastgen, 85-86). It should be noted that the argument of the Tabernacle was used not only by Nicaea II but also by Pope Hadrian in his letter to the Emperors (Mansi, XII, 1069). The LC oppose here the Greeks and the Pope simultaneously.

110. II 9 (Bastgen, 70).
111. I 15 (Bastgen, 35, 14).
112. A. Grabar, "Les Mosaïques de Germigny-des-Prés" *Cahiers Archéologiques*, 7 (1954), pp. 171-172. Grabar is probably correct in saying (p. 175) that not only the apse mosaic but the rest of the decorations of the church were aimed at imitating the description of Solomon's Temple. (I Kings 6 29-35 cherubim, palm trees, flowers on the walls and the doors).
113. Grabar *op. cit.*, p. 171 and Pl. LX. However, I am not completely convinced that the apse mosaic and the other decorations represented Paradise, with the Ark in the Garden, guarded by angels. (Grabar, *op. cit.*, p. 173). Grabar invokes the example of an illustration from the Xth century *Codex Vigilanus* (*op. cit.*, p. 179 and Pl. LXIII), a somewhat remote parallel. At any rate, Grabar's explanation, though very ingenious, presents exegetical difficulties. What Scriptural or patristic authority is there for placing the Mosaic Ark of the Covenant in the primordial paradise? The inscription makes no mention of any "paradise" motif.
114. The characteristic Visigothic orthography of 'cerubin' is common to the inscription and the LC. This is certainly not irrelevant as part of the cumulative evidence for Theodulf's authorship of the LC. See Freeman, *Speculum* 32, pp. 691-92.
115. See Bloch, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-41. The closest parallel he found was in an illustration of the fifth homily of Jacobus Kokkinobaphos (Vat. gr. 1162 — Paris Bibl. Nat. gr. 1208) where the Ark appears as a prefiguration of the Annunciation. Grabar cites the one late XIVth century parallel, at Curtea de Arges, where the Ark is represented in the apse (*op. cit.*, p. 177, note 3). But there is also an unpublished late antique "magical" gem in the British Museum which shows the two cherubim over the Ark. Campbell Bonner describes the gem but does not give a reproduction. ". . . green jasper, has a rather rude representation of the ark of the covenant, with the two cherubim, on an inscription (misspelled) meant for the **tetragrammaton**. . ." (*Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian* (Ann Arbor, 1950), p. 29). Through the kind offices of Prof. Kitzinger, I was able to obtain a photograph of the gem (B.M. cat. no. 56133). The gem clearly shows the ark plus cherubim, and the inscription seems to read "tetrasamer-ton."
116. Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 244.
117. *Ibid.* There is a connection with the iconography of the angels in the Ashburnham Pentateuch.
118. Ex. 25 18-22, I Kings 6 23-28, 2 Chron. 3.10-15.
119. M. Van Berchem and E. Clouzot, *Mosaïques chrétiennes*, (Geneva, 1924), p. 225. "N'ayant q'un ange pour modèle, il [i.e. the artist] en a tiré parti de son mieux non sans ingéniosité et d'une seule figure en a fait quatre, mais on est en droit de supposer qu'il eût été sans doute bien en peine de traiter un autre sujet."
120. I 20 (Bastgen 46, 26-48, 32). After Bede, see *Bedae Venerabilis*

- Opera**, pars II, 2A, ed. D. Hurst, (Turnholt, 1969), pp. 181-82 (=PL 91, 766C-767D). This important discovery is due to Miss Freeman, *Speculum*, 40, p. 281.
121. According to Wallach (*Didascaliae*, p. 512) both the LC and the mosaic are independently inspired by the "textual conflation of the description of the Cherubim offered in 2 Par. 3·10-13 and 3 Reg. 6·23-28". However, such conflation would result in four angels of equal size since both passages (practically identical) talk about angels with "tencubit" wing-spreads. In Exodus 25, though the dimensions of the cherubim are not given, they have to be much smaller, to fit on the two ends of the mercy-seat. Wallach's appeal to the passage from Augustine in I 15 (Bastgen 35, 1-9) in support of his version of conflation seems to be also unfounded, since Augustine only mentions the two cherubim of the Mosaic Tabernacle.
 122. It would be attractive to connect the depiction of the inanimate furnishings of the Sanctuary with the LC's materialistic conception of the image. One could reason that in representing a **manufactured** object, although made under divine guidance, no danger of idolatry could arise in the LC's frame of reference since the image-prototype problem is non-existent: **both** are inanimate objects. But against such thinking it can be argued in turn that the LC do not give special sanction to pictures of objects, also, though the furnishings of the Tabernacle were material things, they were charged with a mysterious force which set them apart from other **opificia manufacta**.
 123. Cf. Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 261.
 124. The sweeping statement of R. P. Hinks to the contrary lacks foundation. Hinks arbitrarily asserts that ". . . the publication of the **Libri Carolini** resulted in the formulation of a number of schemes for the adornment of churches and palaces in all parts of the Frankish realm, as well as in the collection and distribution of suitable models for book-painters and ivory carvers." (*Carolingian Art* (London, 1935), p. 99).

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

MICHAEL PSELLOS ON MAN AND HIS BEGINNINGS

A Philosophical Interpretation of Man's Creation and Fall
by a Byzantine Thinker of the Eleventh Century

By GEORGE KARAHALIOS

Both philosophical and scriptural studies of man's existence and historicity by necessity involve the concept of God; the latter, whether he be conceived as the "par excellence transcendent Mind" — in the case of Greek philosophy, in broad terms — or as the All-benevolent and Omnipotent Will or Absolute Authority that guides history to an end¹ — as in the case of Judaeo-Christian theology — constitutes the logical and ontological beginning, the "ens realissimum," the "first Principle-Arche," the "Prime Mover" in the language of philosophy or the "Creator-Sustainer" in Hebraic-Christian conceptualism.

In this paper, as we follow Psellos' birth-pangs of re-evaluation and re-interpretation of the subject matter, we shall avoid discussions on the existence, transcendence as well as immanence of God, a topic which our thinker cherished and expounded in an orthodox manner.² His long or short discourses on God and Cosmos unveil to us both his keen sense of eclecticism as he juxtaposes the profane and Christian scholarship as well as his boldness of spirit before he draws his own conclusions. These discussions on God and the universe are a fundamental prerequisite for Psellos so that he may introduce to us his undivided philosophico-theological concept of Man, the "crowning of creation."

Throughout the ages, human speculation has realized that Man plays the central role in the Macrocosm (being himself a microcosm) and that there is nothing more worth investigating than him. It is not, of course, within the scope of this study to trace back into history the data of man's self-evaluation and self-analysis.

Despite the powerful impact of the Judaeo-Christian direction and shaping of man's long-discussed existential themata, speculative thought has yet to abandon its search; hence, we find in

every epoch scores of true seekers asking old questions, striving for answers that would possibly help man better his lot, as he acquires a deeper insight of his own self, of his fellow man and of his God.

Psellos is not an exception. The "revealed truth," i.e., the Christian, does not turn him into a passive thinker.³ He painstakingly labors a deep knowledge of the perennial questions of antiquity⁴ as well as of the answers that the leading thinkers throughout the preceding centuries had endeavored. Thus, without minimizing the importance either of the profane philosophy⁵ or of the Christian thought,⁶ he, in turn, poses the same questions.⁷

These questions are obviously not new; but Psellos is! One realizes straightaway, in delving into the Psellian material, that these "problemata" were to him not simply academic or pedantic revaluations. On the contrary, for Psellos, they were as existential and as personal as they could have been to any earnest, well-informed seeker of the truth. They were existential inasmuch as they dealt with his very own existence, being and ultimate destiny. Psellos is new — like every human being that is born — and henceforth, the effort is new! Cultural anthropology teaches us that man gains much from his forerunners in scientific achievements; however, when it comes to evaluating his own existence in relation to that of his fellow-man and to the Supreme (whatever man might consider this to be), he makes it a personal task, test and challenge to reinterpret the apophthegms of his forefathers before he accepts them. A natural question here follows: is Psellos prejudiced in his views? Is he biased in the selection and choice of authorities? To this, we may in general retort: Psellos, like all thinking men, whether of intellectual eminence or not, is a by-product of his times and place. Man, by the time he develops his personality, is already entangled in the web of history-civilization-culture. How then can anyone think totally new? In a totally new way? Who knows what is or constitutes newness? Can Psellos, in our case, be accused of rehashing old clichés? Can he be charged with plagiarism? The answer, despite certain long-harbored suspicions, should be negative. And while it holds true that he borrows his material extensively from well-known profane and Christian sources, he does this in a unique selective 'bee-type' manner, a clear manifestation of his sharp mind and independence of spirit.⁸ Hence, the reconstruction of his philosophico-theological mansions, while they presuppose the building material of a

Parthenon or a St. Sophia, they, at the same time, unveil to us a characteristic personal synthesis and structural plan.⁹ This will become evident as we come next to ponder upon the central theme of all times, namely 'man and his beginnings' or man at the doorstep of eternity.

The First Man and His Creation

"Man has been created by God."¹⁰ The statement not newly incepted, yet clear, allows no room for doubt or further elucidation. Psellos takes the notion *de facto*, reflecting thus the conviction of his times. For, if God (something already discussed elsewhere)¹¹ is the Creator of the whole universe, it follows naturally that he is the Creator of man.¹²

Man, however, is a unique creature, the culmination and apex of God's creative activity, and stands in a very special relation and rapport to God's being; he is the sole creature to be fashioned after the Creator's likeness and image.¹³ Man's creation, Psellos reiterates,¹⁴ follows the creation of the spiritual and material world. God, in his eternal, premundane plan, creates man from the "non-being into being"¹⁵ a "compositum of spirit-soul and body-hyle."¹⁶ Man, according to his rational soul, spirit or mind, belongs to the spiritual realm; according to his body, to that of the material, constituting a link — so to speak — between the two worlds and a bond "of the invisible and visible nature," as Gregory of Nazianzos remarks.¹⁷ And Psellos, picking up the motif, continues along the same lines: "man is created out of contrary natures; of an immutable and a mutable; of an unchangeable and changeable; of an immortal and so-to-say a mortal; so, as if on a scale, equipolely oscillates, leans downward on account of the body, is carried upward on the other hand, on account of the spirit. . ."¹⁸ This composition of man, this "syzygia-conjugation" of body and soul, as Psellos calls it, is of a special kind.

Rest and Sameness of Soul

Having established man's compositum, Psellos now goes on to explain the particular characteristics of "soul and body" or the special "status" of these two opposite natures in the First Man. "The soul was created in rest and sameness; the body, on the other hand, in mutation and change."¹⁹ The notion of the soul's rest is taken by Psellos from Gregory of Nazianzos.²⁰ In his customary way of exposition, our thinker, in a state of bewilderment, bombards his readers with all sorts of questions and

possible answers wondering what the Doctor (i.e. Gregory of Nazianzos) might have meant by that statement in order to finally give us the following interpretation: rest must be ascribed to the soul; this notion of *rest-monē* signifies nothing else but "an inalienable sameness whose nature admits no movement."²¹ In this state of "sameness-identity" the soul rested and glorified God. The notion of "glorification" hides, Psellos remarks, more than the usual meaning of "praise," of "thanksgiving" and the like. The etymology of the verb "*doxologeîn*" is "to have an opinion and an understanding of someone; thus, "to rest and glorify the Benefactor means nothing else but to have a true opinion of the Creator (i.e. God)."²² Immediately, however, an objection follows: how is it possible, Psellos contends, for "a created nature,"²³ even for the soul, "to have an opinion" i.e., to understand God? To this, our philosopher, after a long penetrating discussion, points out that, testimony to God's existence or evidence to God's presence, we find in the entire Cosmos; even Matter (*Hyle*), the last order in the hierarchical *skala* of beings and strictly speaking something between "being and non-being" attests to God's existence,²⁴ or "echoes God's existence"²⁵ for the fact that it houses within itself the potentiality of "receiving the *eidos*."²⁶ And although Psellos assumes *a priori* the existence of God, when he comes to discuss the "what" might this existence or essence be, he finds himself at a loss and favors greatly the "*via negationis*" in handling the subject of his query. Nonetheless, despite this apophatic approach of defining God, that is, of "understanding His essence," he vests the Higher Beings with certain "reflections-mirrorings" of the "what God is." The concept of these "mirrorings" becomes understandable if we hold with Psellos that the entire Creation stands as a "hierarchy of higher to lower beings;" the higher beings find themselves closer to God. This proximity to the Divine Source results in a truer or brighter reflection of God's *ousia*.

The Soul, to be sure, is numbered amongst the higher creatures; it is an image having imprints of the *Paradeigma* which in turn is found in God.²⁷ Thus, Psellos concludes that the Soul "in its akin rest and unchangeable *tautotes*-sameness (something which the Divine has in the utmost degree) could have true knowledge of God."²⁸ Exactly what we are to understand with Psellos under "knowledge of God," will be the consideration at a later point. Let us now follow a bit closer the second part of our previous

quotation whereby the "body was created in mutation and change."²⁹ In contrasting this statement with the first part, namely of the Soul's rest and sameness, we immediately see that our thinker draws a clear dividing line between the two and while he dons the Soul with divine traits (imprints), he robes the body with certain "passions" called "unperverting-adiavleta." These so-called "unperverting or undistorting" passions, Psellos explains, were indicative of the body's weakness or imperfection,³⁰ attributable to the nature of hyle-matter; such unperverting passions were, e.g., hunger, thirst, etc., which the body received by Nature and consequently, ought to fill and empty itself, resulting thus in a constant change of replenishing and emptying.³¹ The Soul, on the contrary, did not possess and did not participate in these undistorting passions, hence, its constant "rest and sameness." But how, Psellos asks, could the body have undergone any kind of 'passion or suffering' before man was subject to death? For every passion or affection leads to corruption.³² If man, then, was subject to corruption before his 'transgression or fall' or was led to corruption, what more could he have undergone after that? To this interrogation he gives us the following answer: "the body was not created entirely passionless nor did it undergo any later passions; it did, though, share in the unperverting affections, those which connately are attached to it. . . however, it was at a later time that the evil stains of the passions were imprinted on it, when the soul gave into the struggle and the body acquired authority over the soul. Thus, it was necessary for the first Man to sweat, to change the (skin's) color, to change place (locomotion), to hunger and thirst."³³ As already mentioned, all passions lead to corruption, but not death. Death is the extreme corruption, total or par excellence (haplos phthora).³⁴ This was not so with the first Man; he was amenable to a partial corruption (ten tina phthoran) which we all undergo, being in part disintegrated through the changes and mutations of eating, drinking, etc.³⁵ If the first Man had been created 'unchangeable and incorruptible' according to both soul and body, Psellos argues, he would have swaggered against his creator, like satan, who lost permanently his celestial rank.³⁶

But the first Man did fall and did lose his "rank and place" in the hierarchy of beings, despite God's warning (if we may use this anthropomorphic expression). However, it must be pointed out here that Psellos sees a great difference between Man's and satan's fall. The latter, because of his very 'ousia', being simplex and

immaterial, resulted in a total and irrevocable fall, commensurate to his spiritual degree of beingness; Man, on the other hand, being created composite of soul and body, partially mortal and partially immortal, had a partial fall and henceforth a partial death. This undoubtedly is a highly controversial subject which has caused, since antiquity, much debate and discord. Psellos, without claiming total solution, discusses the matter anew, full of zest and positive thinking. The rationalization and clarification of the entire subject, as far as the Judaeo-Christian world is concerned, is to be found in the well-known formula of the Old Testament (Genesis 1, 26), whereby the first Man was created "after God's likeness and image."³⁷ To this motif we now turn.

The "Likeness and Image" Formula

"Only man, amongst all the created beings," Psellos comments, "has been fashioned after the likeness and image of his creator; for this reason, we ought not attribute to the celestial powers (i.e. Angels or Intelligences) what is characteristic of the "likeness and image man," neither to the higher nor to the lower ones. This 'likeness and image' formula characterizes distinctly the difference between the human species and the angelic (or original hypostases)."³⁸ Image (*eikon*), in this case, is nothing else but "an illumination — flash of God's *ousia*."³⁹ All created entities, to be sure, share in God's own goodness (*agathotes*), from the highest to the lowest, including *hyle*. This participation, otherwise put, this aptitude into receiving the "Eidos" or 'divine appearance' however, is not possessed equally by all creatures;⁴⁰ and although God sends his "illuminations-flashes equally and uniformly to all, every creature receives them in proportion to its own nature, in a lesser or major degree."⁴¹

In the case of man, his "image-created" soul, being a reflection of God's essence, tries to liken itself to its akin paradigm.⁴² The "kat'eikona" therefore underlies and represents the potency, or better still, the potentiality of man to do righteous works and is sort of an "arche," a starting point, of good deeds.⁴³ In the words of John of Damascus,⁴⁴ "it declares the intelligibility and free will." The "kat'eikona," furthermore, constitutes an innate power that enables man to imitate or to liken himself unto God.⁴⁵

Psellos, in his effort to clarify the "likeness and image" formula, uses the known expression of: "we have been created in honor"⁴⁶ equalling this "honor - time" with the striving of the soul to total likeness to the Prototypon, i.e., God.⁴⁷ The

"kat'eikona" runs parallel to Aristotle's "dynamai" formulation;⁴⁸ this represents, as we already have seen, the innate potency of man to reach God. The "likeness," on the other hand, reflects the "energeia," that is, the perfection achieved through virtue and knowledge.⁴⁹ The "likeness," therefore, was not given to man from the outset or connately, for this is a self-motivated energy and a "finished-completed image" (lit., hung-up picture).⁵⁰ It is the "kat'eikona" that entitles and enables man with the ability to "direct himself and return to God,"⁵¹ while the "likeness" typifies the achieved goal. The from "image-to-likeness" notion represents the process from the potential to the actual, from the imperfect to the perfect.⁵² Finally Psellos, echoing St. Basil,⁵³ sums up the "image-likeness" theme thusly: "the kat'eikona, on the one hand, must be understood as referring to the natural, viz., innate logos in us, possessing the ability to every virtue; the likeness, on the other, as referring to virtue *per se*, when, to wit, we bring the innate potency of the soul into act, according to the ratio of likeness."⁵⁴

The Ability of the First Man to Reach God; God's Climactic Revelation

Man's special double structure called for a concerted effort, a deliberate choice and a cooperation with Providence to bring his imperfect, earthly and corruptible aspect step-by-step closer to the Divine. God did not empower man to immediately or purely converse with Him.⁵⁵ Man's creation entailed a certain evolution, an education, a more intimate learning and acquaintance of himself and the rest of the created world. The first Man ought to have developed his 'image' into 'likeness' as much as this was feasible to him. This means that man was of a rather weak nature and a total and immediate (direct) revelation of God would have ruined him completely.⁵⁶ Thus, God conceived (to use again, human language) of a timely revelation, allowing man's mind to strengthen itself first in the lower "gnoses;" this the Creator did, not out of envy, but rather using the best paedagogic and economic motives.⁵⁷ In our forthcoming discussion on the meaning of Paradise, we shall be able to clarify Psellos' position satisfactorily. Here, let it be pointed out that Man was neither fashioned capable of receiving directly and immediately the Divine Eidos (i.e. God) nor did the Creator reveal himself to him straightaway (i.e. in all His glory); the former would have been contrary to man's double and composite nature, the latter against

God's providence.⁵⁸ Notwithstanding, God had "planted in the soul of the first Man all the *eide* of knowledge,"⁵⁹ and having awarded him with 'logos and free will,' Man could have reached, through the guidance of Providence, both the "theory of creation and the comprehension of the Supreme."⁶⁰ Man in the beginning was in a harmonic relationship with his Creator and with himself, and although his nature was composite, yet it possessed a certain "oneness and unity," qualities — in their extreme — characterizing God's *ousia*. Man, through his inner harmonic hierarchy, could have participated into the One,⁶¹ meaning that he could have attained a relatively integral knowledge. Nonetheless, he did not succeed, since he willingly broke his inner unity, marring his "kat'eikona" and thus alienating himself from God.⁶²

Origin of Soul — God's Breath

Every created being, whether material or immaterial, mortal or immortal, celestial or earthly, is the result of the "creative cause," i.e., God, the principle of genesis of all beings.⁶³

The soul, likewise, has as its creative cause, God. Now, Psellos asks: how did this come about? In what manner or fashion did God create the soul? Then he rushes to answer his own question, distinguishing it from the "presentations of the Greeks."⁶⁴ "We, (he states, and it is obvious that he means the Christian philosophers) substantiate (*ousiopoioimen*) from the breath which God breathed into the first man."⁶⁵ "It does not emanate from the stars taking abode in the body, nor does nature beget it, nor *rationes seminales* shoot it forth into the body, but it descends from God above."⁶⁶ The breath (*emphysema*, lit. 'a breathing-in') motif has been taken from Genesis⁶⁷ where it is stated that God "breathed in his (man's) face a breath of life and man became a living soul."⁶⁸ However, the weight of the first statement of Psellos⁶⁹ lies in the use of the philosophical term "substantiate" (*ousiopoio*) a direct result of God's own act (*viz.* breathing) on man.⁷⁰ The choice of Psellos' word corroborates the ratification of his other expressions "created in honor,"⁷¹ for the soul is something divine, and an image of the prototype good, *viz.*, God.⁷²

In this section, our main aim and concern was to point out and emphasize the fact that the soul of the first man derived its being from God directly and, as already discussed, reflects to a certain measure, in itself, God's *ousia*.

Psellos defends this with all his might without neglecting to

mention what "the Greeks held" before him, denying categorically all other origin and cause of the soul's creation save that of God's own free and deliberate action.

Is the Soul *Anarchos* — *Athanatos* — *Aionios* — *Aidios*?

We have seen that the soul as such has not caused its own being, i.e., is not self-generated and that it has been created by God. This automatically excludes the notion of its pre-existence, which Psellos denies forcefully.⁷³ He therefore denies the attribute 'anarchos' which either means that the soul is not a cause in itself,⁷⁴ or that "it does not have a prior cause."⁷⁵

The *aidios* = everlasting (lit., the ever-the-same-staying) attribute, however, can be ascribed to soul. Psellos follows Gregory of Nazianzos in the definition of these terms,⁷⁶ commenting: "everlasting (means) that which is certainly derived from a principle, yet has not limit/end."⁷⁷ The "*anarchon*," therefore, by necessity, is "everlasting;" for what has not "cause of beginning" how can it die and be annihilated? The reason of annihilation is the remoteness from the Cause, like that which receives its motion by another, it stops being moved as soon as the moving agent ceases moving it.⁷⁸

Furthermore, the "*anarchon*" is necessarily "everlasting," but not *vice versa*. The soul and the mind, for example, are everlasting and ever-living (*aeizoa*) but not *anarcha* for they have a cause and a beginning. Psellos remarks that everlasting conveys the same meaning with ever-living; the everlasting (*aidion*) is more universal, the ever-living (*aeizoon*) more particular. (The ever-living presupposes life.) Whereas the Greeks distinguish both of these, contending that wherever the 'ever-living' applies, the 'everlasting' holds true, but not the other way around. That is, not all the 'everlasting' are 'immortal' (in this case *aeizoon kai athanaton*) mean one and the same thing). 'Immortal' pertains, they say — Psellos clarifies — to that which has received life, like soul, mind and all other beings, that come after God; however, the heavens (*Uranos*), in calling it *ateleuteton* viz., "with no end," they do not say "immortal" but "everlasting;" for death is privation of life and that which has not received life, cannot die. For this reason, the "immortal," on the one hand, are also "everlasting," so they say, but not "immortal" the "everlasting."⁷⁹

From the above comments of Psellos, it is evident that the soul can be characterized as: (a) everlasting (b) ever-living and immortal and (c) eternal⁸⁰ (according to its *ousia*, but not activity).

Our discussion referred to the soul of the first man — later to be called also “rational soul” — and every attribute was related to the soul *per se* or to its *ousia*.

The Freedom of Soul

The basic presupposition of the first man's freedom of soul is that of the definition that Psellos gives, namely that: “the soul is a divine thing and image of the prototype beauty; every image, however, is likened to the archetype, which is God himself.”⁸¹ Now it is a fact that the soul can perceive in itself “divine marks and acknowledge the inner reflection of the Archetypon.”⁸² This “self-awareness of the image,” is also called a “contemplation of dignity.”⁸³ Both, then, the ‘self-realization’ and ‘self-awareness’ of the soul (of being God's own image and special dignity) rendered it free from all passion and a living doxology to God.

Psellos pointedly emphasizes this relation of the soul with God, when he uses verbs like ‘beheld-heora’⁸⁴ ‘being cognizant-eidyia’⁸⁵ when it becomes ‘conscious-ei’epignoe’⁸⁶ concluding that such an acknowledgement would lead the soul back to its original nobility of freedom.⁸⁷ Put in a different manner, the full awareness of the soul's own dignity was nothing else but complete freedom, for Psellos equalizes both in one stroke thusly: “the soul being aware of its own freedom and original dignity” could have broken all ties with the body and made its return to God as its ultimate Freedom.

One last point to consider: the soul possessed or originally enjoyed freedom because of the fact that the first man, before his estrangement from God, constituted a ‘oneness,’⁸⁸ on account of his inner unity and harmony. As soon, though, as the soul cast off its ‘image-kat’eikona’ beauty, this inner divine unity was broken⁸⁹ and consequently its freedom lost.

The Meaning of Paradise⁹⁰

What is the meaning of the scriptural Paradise, of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, of the Fall of the first man? Straight-away one understands that Psellos is not willing to accept, as recorded in Genesis,⁹¹ these statements at face value. His sharp and inquisitive nature seeks to unveil the allegorical or prophetic sayings, without feeling guilty of violating their truth. On the contrary, siding with Gregory of Nazianzos,⁹² he ridicules those (even from our own side) who physically or superficially and not spiritually explain and understand these matters. In re-evaluating the scriptural data, on the one hand, he never speaks with

contempt or in a derogatory manner about the validity and trustworthiness of the accounts, neither does he betray any feeling of insecurity or doubt about his given explanations. But let us give the highlights of his discussions on the topic.

Question: What is really meant by paradise? Paradise, first of all, even if the scriptures refer to it as a certain physical locality, must not be conceived as such. On the contrary, and Psellos clarifies: "Paradise is the soul of the first man whereby all the trees, i.e., the eide of knowledge, were planted."⁹³ And for that matter, not the entire soul, but "its leading or rational part."⁹⁴ Subsequently, the 'Tree of Knowledge of good and evil' symbolizes for one, "the theory of creation" or 'the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge,' the divine wisdom and the simplex and un-deviating knowledge through which the soul receives immortality;⁹⁵ and secondly, "the comprehension of the Being, i.e., God."⁹⁶ Now while all the eide of knowledge were implanted in the man's soul, the specific eidos on the theory of creation and on the comprehension of the Supreme Being, were placed in the center of his soul.⁹⁷ With this comment, Psellos wants to make clear that the objects of contemplation of the first man were not on the same level of importance but rather constituted a 'gradation' from lower degree to the higher, from "naming" (i.e., knowing) the inferior into finally grasping the superior. There was supposed to have been an evolution in this knowledge and understanding whereby man ought to have started from the simpler truths and having worked on them to reach the higher, arriving ultimately into the highest possible.⁹⁸ Therefore, "he (i.e., Adam) ought to have first cleansed his senses and worked on the practical aspect of virtues. . . then as soon as the sense organs were strengthened and received power distinguishing better from worse, then (ought to have) approached the loftier understanding about the creatures. . . etc. Having finally acquired an exact knowledge of these things and having stood theoretically aloof through the mind, he could have tasted of the Tree of Life (i.e., understood the theory of creation) and spoken purely and truly to God himself."⁹⁹ Put in a different way, as already seen, man should have worked on his image, his innate potency and ability and then reach the likeness, the process and evolution of his *dynamei* into the *energeia*.

The Fall of Man

However, man did not follow the above process of normally and hierarchically evolving from the lower to the loftier 'theories' and without due preparation and spiritual strengthening, while still caught up in the web of the "hyle"¹⁰⁰ failed to see the beauty and harmony of the created nature missing thusly the "contemplations of life"¹⁰¹ and found himself "fallen and dead."¹⁰²

The failure to de-materialize his senses, so-to-speak, to free his "hegemonikon" from the finite things and confusing the temporary for the "real contemplation," resulted in inner disorder and fall from attaining the direct "talk with God."

The Biblical Adam and Eve¹⁰³

What are we to understand with the biblical Adam and Eve in regard to the Fall? What is hidden behind their allegorical names? Psellos asks: "how is it that God said to Adam, 'thou shall not eat from the Tree of Knowledge,' in singular form, yet turning in plural declared, 'in the day ye shall eat, ye shall die?'¹⁰⁴ For Eve was not as yet fashioned."¹⁰⁵ To this he gives the following answer: "Because of the fact that the dynamis in us has one part exactly like male, i.e., the mind, the other is like female, i.e., the sense, the sophist of wickedness (satan) does not attack directly the virile aspect of the soul, but deceives first, the female sense and thus through it, he usurps the leadership of the mind. And the sense, on the one hand, is being deceived, while the mind, on the other hand, is persuaded by the sense, and thus (we have) the deceiver and the misled, the commandment (God's) being violated through the sense. Hence the fall from Paradise."¹⁰⁶

In Psellos' conceptualism it is clear that, under the scriptural Adam and Eve, man is to understand mind and sense respectively. The progenitors are not two people existing individually and committing the error together. On the contrary, there is only one! We must exercise care in qualifying this 'first individual' and his singularity. Psellos does not seem to bother to comment on the physical aspect of the existence of this first man except perhaps for the "unperverting passions." His concern is centered upon his spiritual status, harmony and oneness. Thus, he comes to explain the Adam-Eve motif, arguing the contradictory statement of Genesis 2, 17f., where God forbids Adam to eat from the Tree of Knowledge, etc., foretelling of the death they both will undergo

in case of disobedience. Psellos states: To forbid God "in singular number" and then to bring upon the threat of disobedience 'in plural form' means this: "While we are in the Good, we preserve the oneness in us, as we unify ourselves to the one God; as soon as we turn into the evil, we find ourselves away from God 'a plurality' instead of oneness. For this reason, Adam before the disobedience was one; after it, his oneness was broken up into a multitude."¹⁰⁷

The scriptural Fall or the breaking-up of man's inner unity and oneness is nothing else but the de-robing of divine power with which the mind was clad and the stripping of the persuasive ability of the sense.¹⁰⁸ The stripping of mind and sense from the divine knowledge results in the plurality of the inner man and subsequent fall from paradise.

We have tried to reconstruct and capture as succinctly as possible, Psellos' understanding and teaching of the "Beginnings of Man." It remains true, however, that this paper has only shown a part of Psellos' anthropology. It is logically and ontologically imperative, in order to have a round picture of our philosopher's anthropological conceptualism, to consider Man in the "hic et nunc;" strictly speaking, this is what we ought to have done from the outset, and not vice versa. It is hoped, though, that in the near future we shall have the opportunity to publish this second part and thus explain many statements made in this present paper in anticipation.

HELLENIC COLLEGE

ABBREVIATIONS

- Ps. I and II = E. Kurtz - F. Drexl, *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita*, Vol. I (Milano, 1936); Vol. II (1940).
 Ps. IV and V = K. Sathas, *Mesaionike Vivliotheke*, Vol. IV (Athens-Paris, 1874) and Vol. V (Venice-Paris, 1876).
 1182 = Cod. Parisin. gr. 1182 (Psellos' Works).
 W. = L. G. Westerink, *Michael Psellus, de Omnifaria Doctrina*, Critical Text and Introduction (Utrecht, 1948).
 PG = J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (Vol. 122).

FOOTNOTES

1. Cf., Rudolf Bultmann, *History and Eschatology* (New York, 1962), p. 94ff.
2. Cf., W. chaps. 1-20, also 1182, 11v 27ff., 302r 12ff., also D. I. Koutsogiannopoulos, *Ἡ Θεολογικὴ Σκέψις τοῦ Μ. Ψελλοῦ* (Athens, 1965), p. 211.
3. When accused by his old friend and later Patriarch John Xiphilinos as a "Plato-lover" because of his very way of boldly "sylogizesthai," he challenges that this process of "thinking out" for one's self is not foreign to the Church's doctrine, rather an instrument to the truth. Cf., Ps. V, p. 447.
4. Ps. V, pp. 55-56, 507, 509-10; Ps. I, pp. 428-32.
5. Ps. I, pp. 441-50; Ps. II, p. 59; 1182, 274v 38f.; 18r 12ff.
6. W. pp. 98-99; Cf. Ps. II, p. 312 for a vivid contrast and comparison of the profane and Christian "logia."
7. 1182, 302r 2ff.; Ps. V, p. 56.
8. Cf., J. Bidez, *Épître sur la Chrysopée - La Daimonologie du M. Psellos*, Catal. mss. alch. gr. VI (Brussels, 1928), p. IX.
9. Cf., P. Joannou, *Christliche Metaphysik in Byzanz; Die Illuminationslehre des M. Psellos und Johannes Italos*. *Studia Patristica et Byzantina* (Ettal, 1956), p. 7.
10. 1182, 20r 27; Ps. I, p. 404.
11. Cf., W. p. 25.
12. Psellos follows at this point the Judaeo-Christian account of an *ex nihilo* creation defended as early as the Second Century A.D. by Theophilus of Antioch (Apol. ad Autolycum, II. 4) against some Platonic views of Justin (Apol. I. 59) and Clement of Alexandria (Strom., V. 14) regarding the pre-existence of hyle.
13. Genesis 1, 26.; cf., Ps. I, p. 411.
14. John of Damascus, PG, 94, 1136.
15. St. Basil, PG, 31, 253.

16. 1182, 12v 44, St. Basil, *ibid.* 30, 140, 29, 337, also John Chrysostom, PG, 53, 117. Moreover, for the simultaneous genesis of man out of soul and body, cf., Ps. I, p. 404 as juxtaposed to that of Origen, *De princ.*, 1, 7,, cf., also Plut., *Mor.* p. 450 D 91.
17. PG, 36, 317 f., 632; also PG, 35, 481 where "man is dust and spirit, a visible and invisible living creature, temporary and eternal, earthly and celestial, touching God. . . .etc."
18. 1182, 13r 38ff. This motif of "oscillation" reminds me of Herakleitos' "two ways. upward-downward" of the elements Fire (Soul) and Earth (Body). Cf., J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* (New York, 1957), p. 152.
19. 1182, 12v 44.
20. PG, 36, 632 B.
21. 1182, 12v 43f.
22. 1182, 13r 13f.
23. Since the idea of Creation immediately introduces the limiting factors of space and time.
24. 1182, 13r 16f.
25. 1182, 280v 33.
26. Ps. II, p. 122. The writer is well aware of the implicated difficulties and impasses of this platonic, aristotelian and neo-platonic 'eidos/form-hyle/matter' controversy; however, it is not within the scope of this short study to enter this two-edged sword-problem, about which other abler students of Plato or Aristotle have sufficiently labored.
27. 1182, 281v 26; 13r 15; 311r 7.
28. 1182, 13r 20.
29. 1182, 12v 45.
30. The Greek Fathers, based primarily on Sophia Sirah 17, 1-3, agree that the first Man was created rational, free-willed, with the potentiality to liken himself unto God in concurrence with Divine Grace. Man was not created completely perfect in every respect from the beginning. Irenaeos, e.g., taught that the first people in Paradise were created 'infants' and ought to have grown in spiritual maturity. . . .etc. (*Adv. haer.* IV, 38, 3, PG, 7, 1108). John of Damascus, on the other hand, (F. O. II, 11. 12. 30., PG, 94, 912f., 920f., 976f., etc.) writes man was created by God "without wickedness, upright, virtuous, carefree, without grief, adorned with all virtue, earthly and celestial, temporal and immortal, sensible and intelligible, sinless in his nature. . . .sinless I mean, not that he could not commit a sin, but to sin was not in his very nature, it rather rested in his free choice."
31. 1182, 13r 1ff.
32. 1182, 13r 23f.
33. 1182, 13r 25ff.
34. 1182, 13r 32.
35. 1182, 13r 32f.
36. 1182, 13r 32-34.

37. Psellos, a fervent and intelligent student of Plato, is fully aware of the same motif in the *Timaeus* 30 C-D, as regards the affinity and likeness of the entire Creation to God, yet he chooses to adhere to the Judaeo-Christian version of it.
38. Ps. I, p. 411.
39. 1182, 266v 9f., also 307v 5ff
40. 1182, 266v 4ff.
41. 1182, 308r 36f., cf., also P. Joannou, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
42. W., Chapt. 48, 6-7.
43. W., Chapt. 48, 11.
44. PG, 94, 920
45. Ps. I, p. 413.
46. Ps. I, pp. 412-13.
47. Ps. IV, p. 397.
48. Cf., St. Basil, PG, 30, 29f.
49. Ps. I, p. 413.
50. W., chapt. 48, 12.
51. 1182, 20r 27.
52. Ps. I, p. 411, cf., also I. Q. Kalogerou, "Ἡ περὶ συνεργασίας ἐν τῇ δικαιοῦσαι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία ἐξ ἐπόψεως ὀρθοδόξου καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὴν συζητήσεις ἑτεροδόξων" (Thessalonike, 1953), p. 13 ff
53. PG, 30, 29f., (*De opif. hom I Orat.*), also John of Damascus, F. O. II, 30, PG, 94, 977.
54. Ps. I, p. 411.
55. 1182, 16r 9.
56. 1182, 16r 20ff.
57. 1182, 16r 25.
58. 1182, 16r 20f. & 25f.
59. 1182, 15v 39f. & 25f.
60. 1182, 15v 42f.
61. 1182, 307v 8ff.
62. 1182, 307v 12ff.
63. W, Chapt. 49, 4.
64. *Ibid*, Chapt. 49, also Ps. IV, p. 446.
65. W. chapt. 49, 6-7.
66. PG, 1144 D; also W. Chapt. 47, 7-9, cf , Plot. ENN. V 1, 1
67. Genesis 2, 7.
68. Ps. I, p. 253.
69. Cf , W. chapt. 49.
70. 1182, 13r 8f.
71. Ps. I, pp. 412 & 413.
72. 1182, 281v 26, also Ps. II, p. 71.

73. 1182, 12v 19, 30r 42.
74. W., chapt. 49, 2.
75. 1182, 276v 39.
76. Cf., PG, 36, 77 A 13.
77. 1182, 276v 40.
78. 1182, 276v 42f.
79. 1182, 276v 40-46, 277r 1-16.
80. J. Bidez, *ibid.* p. 175, PG, 1041 C, 1048 D-49 A, W., Chapt. 30 & 53, also appendix II, 1182, 300v 31ff., Plato, *Phaedrus* 245C 5
81. 1182, 281v 26.
82. 1182, 13r 8f.
83. 1182, 13r 41.
84. *Ibid.*
85. 1182, 281v 33.
86. 1182, 283v 30.
87. *Ibid.*
88. 1182, 307v 8.
89. 1182, 307v 11.
90. Space does not allow an elaborate account or even a synopsis of the "Paradise theme" and its various interpretations. Needless to say, the whole biblical narrative, most likely of Babylonian origin, has been treated variously by countless scholars throughout the ages.
91. Genesis, 2, 9-11.
92. PG, 36 (*Orat.* 45) 632 D; 1182, 15v 31f.
93. 1182, 15v 39.
94. Ps. I, p. 415.
95. *Ibid.* p. 416.
96. 1182, 15v 43f.
97. 1182, 15v 42; 16r 9.
98. Ps. I, p. 416.
99. 1182, 16r 2ff.
100. 1182, 16r 26, Plat., *Phaedrus*, 248a ff., cf., A. E. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and his Work* (Oxford, 1926), p. 307f.
101. 1182, 16r 18.
102. 1182, 16r 16-19.
103. Psellos is aware of the inner allegory of the name ADAM, as corresponding to the **four elements** (i.e., fire, air, water, earth), as well as the encompassing notion of his universality, i.e., to the **four points** of the Globe (A-natole/East, D-ysis/West, A-rktos/North, M-esembria/South), for he comments that "the name ADAM is a tetrastichon" (where στοιχῆον means both **letter** of the alphabet and **element**. Cf., Ps. I, p. 408). The idea of "tetrastichon or tetragrammaton" seems to originate from the Sibyll. Or., III, 24-6.
For further details, see Festugière, O. P., *La Révélation d'Hermès*

Trismégiste, I. (2nd Ed., Paris 1950) pp. 268, 3,4/269, 2,3. I am cognizant of the difficulties involved in the exegesis of the first chapters of Genesis (Order of Cosmogony in six days, etc.) and the creation of Adam. Unfortunately, space does not permit us here to elaborate on this complicated matter, in a sense, it would have been irrelevant, for Psellos does not seem to be troubled with the inconsistencies of the Genesis' account, neither does he cleave to its literal meaning. For a well written resume on the topic, its intricacies and problems, see Walter Boehm, Johannes **Philoponos** (Munich, 1967), pp. 388-406, where both aspects, Christian and profane, are discussed.

104. Genesis, 2, 17-18.

105. 1182, 15v 26ff.

106. Ps. I., p. 416.

107. 1182, 16r 39-43.

108. Ps. I., p. 416.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

wisdom, by complete knowledge of the sources and total grasping of the problems involved

The present book is a scholarly and lucid examination of the **Song of Songs**. In his Introduction (pp. 1-14) Prof. Trempelas examines the name of the book, the unity of the Song and its philological character as a lyric poem and as a dramatic work. The main body of the book (pp. 15-96) contains the Greek text of the **Song of Songs**, a very free paraphrase and its interpretation mainly according to the Fathers of the Church. At the end, in a long Appendix (pp. 97-122), Prof. Trempelas presents the **Song of Songs** as a play in three acts with a literal rendition in Modern Greek. In this part also the famous analysis of F. Godet is given.

The **Song of Songs**, Professor Trempelas maintains, narrates the events of the mystic marriage of our Lord Jesus Christ to the Church. Soulamitis, the protagonist in the **Song**, a beautiful and chaste, lovely and faithful virgin, is an admirable type for the Church. Christ and Church, their mutual love, their ineffable union--this is the true meaning and immediate notion of this superb poem. And this is what the universal Christian tradition has always declared as the main meaning of the **Song** before any other acceptance. However, besides this, which is his basic belief concerning the **Song**, the author also presents several secondary interpretations, and now and then some of the diverging ones.

All in all this book is a worthwhile attempt at a serious interpretation of that poem. We may add, however, that the **Song of Songs** has been translated into Modern Greek by several scholars and poets, (for instance, by K. Frilingos, A. Pernaris, K. Chrysanthis, Arch. Leontios Hadjicostis, George Seferis, and others) who saw it primarily as poetry rather than as a theological treatise. But poetry is not Prof. Trempelas' first purpose. His main concern is the presentation and discussion of the theological problems raised in the famous Biblical poem, its religious interpretation and moral meaning, and its general application in human life and faith. And this task he has competently fulfilled.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

Hellenic College

E. P. PANAGOPOULOS, **Νέα Σμύρνη. Μία Ἑλληνικὴ Ὀδύσσεια τοῦ 18ου αἰῶνα**. Translated into Modern Greek by Korallia Krokodelos. Athens: Editions "Kalvos", 1972. Pp. 314. Dr. 80.

E. P. Panagopoulos, professor of American History at California State University, Saint Jose, is the writer of many historical treatises. This book, **New Smyrna. A Greek Odyssey of the 18th Century**, written first in English and published by Florida University in 1966, has now been beautifully translated into Modern Greek by Korallia Krokodelos. It deals with the first establishment of Greek colonists in great numbers in America, specifically in Eastern Florida in 1768. The subtitle, "a Greek Odyssey of the 18th century", denotes not only the sea "odyssey" of Greeks (as well as of

Italians, Corsicans, and Minorcans), i.e. the hardships they suffered until they could reach America (1767-1768), but much more intends to suggest the adventures and misfortunes, the sufferings and final disaster they experienced during the few years (1768-1777) that the colony of New Smyrna, created by the strange and ambitious Dr. Andrew Turnbull, existed.

Dr. A. Turnbull had controlled a large region in central eastern Florida given to him and his associates by the British Government. For the cultivation, development and exploitation of that land he decided, instead of using black slaves from Africa, to bring over white people from Greece, Italy, Corsica and Minorca. So, with big and enticing promises he gathered about 1400 people who (some fleeing from the slavery of Turks and all from the evils of extreme poverty,) were easily persuaded to follow the visionary adventurer toward the "paradise" of a new life in America. During the long voyage from the Mediterranean to Florida the unsuspecting travelers were decimated by hardships and deprivations in the crowded and risky vessels. However, many more died during the first year of their miserable residence in the inhospitable and unsanitary New Smyrna of Florida, as well as during the following years. They died of diseases and hunger, hardships of every sort, cruel and tedious work. And they were free no more. Just as the blacks from Africa, they too became virtual slaves. They worked for long hours under the most horrible conditions; they lived in makeshift huts, famished and sick, without medical care, without income or freedom, with no support or hope. Dr. Turnbull, and especially his representatives, overseers and other officers, treated the colonists-workers rudely: They beat them wildly, left them without food, threw them into jail with iron chains, humiliated them. Those unhappy immigrants did not even have the right to leave New Smyrna and move to any other place. Thus, disappointment and hardships led these white slaves to protests and revolts, which, however, resulted in even worse afflictions, heavier punishments, and actual decimation of these wretched people. Attacks by the Indians, obstructive opposition by the regional British Governor who was a personal enemy of Turnbull, jealousy and retaliations by other foes of Turnbull both in Florida and England, diseases and financial failures, rendered the colony's life nightmarish, and its survival all the more difficult and problematic. For these reasons, the few inhabitants that managed somehow to survive escaped little by little to the neighboring city of Saint Augustine or to other places, especially when the revolution against British colonialism started in the Northern and neighboring states. Thus New Smyrna was finally destroyed.

The book is written as an objective historical work--as much as it can be objective creation of a keenly alive intellect. The work is a systematic and methodical exposition based upon published and unpublished sources and upon all other direct and indirect information available. Professor Panagopoulos studied carefully all relevant books and articles in journals; he investigated thousands of documents in archives and libraries of America and Europe; he discovered and utilized many unknown elements, and finally, he conscientiously and judiciously tried to put--and he did put--some order to the sometimes contradictory evidence from those documents, and assiduously worked that vast material to compose his work in a scholarly manner. The high scholarly quality of his work is evident in the vivid reconstruction of the major and minor historical events with continuity, consistency and

persuasiveness; it is also mirrored in the fifty densely printed pages of enlightening notes and relevant bibliography at the book's end they present and ascertain the author's searching toil to reach historical truth. The book closes with a very helpful index of persons and things. However, the lack of a map of the New Smyrna region is unfortunate.

Professor Panagopoulos is a historian who also has ability for literary composition. He is writing history with the warmth of a novelist, with the talent of a narrator who arrests the reader's attention with his lively narration. Therefore his book is not a dry, soulless, reconstruction of New Smyrna's history. It is much more. It is also the fascinating story of a group of people who started with a dream of happiness and freedom only to end in a hell of slavery and misery. The leading characters, such as Dr. Turnbull, Governor Tonym, Councilor Drayton, and others, are vividly depicted. But even the secondary persons, and primarily the wronged and deceived white slaves, play their roles powerfully and persuasively in the dramatic evolution of the events. Pain and toil, indignation and hate, disease and famine, were their only lot from life. Thus their existence is described as it became disjointed from day to day and rolled down toward the lowest living level, often to their total annihilation. On the other hand the powerful persons, with their open or covert knavery, with their merciless exploitation of so many people, and with their destructive jealousies and antagonisms, fell into an evil circle of actions that precipitated the final catastrophe. In general, the writer has resurrected the life in New Smyrna with precision of thought and imagery in a finely constructed style.

New Smyrna is an epic as well as a "dramatic page of the chronicle of Greek Diaspora". And we well know the great importance that the dispersion of Greeks through all lands from ancient times until today has had for Hellenism. But, as the writer rightly observes, "New Smyrna's history, although it is a moving episode of the Greek history, is also a page of the American history". However, I think that the reader of the book will see it primarily as the painful and fascinating story of a human endeavor that failed because of human wickedness and weakness. Professor Panagopoulos writes in his Prologue "To the eyes of this author, suddenly the collected material gave to the New Smyrna story the form of a Greek tragedy. As the **dramatis personae** moved to their destiny, their voices revealing their minds and hearts, came clearly through an abundance of powerful documents. As they talked, they used words that expressed their feelings and re-created the lost atmosphere in which the plot developed. It was for this reason that the protagonists were left in this book to tell by themselves as much of the story as possible. The task of the historian was thus limited to the role of the ancient chorus: Bring forth a timehonored experience, set the stage, point out meaningful relationships, and draw conclusions." (pp. 20-21) And indeed, E. P. Panagopoulos has proved himself an excellent organizer, composer, and thoughtful narrator of that dramatic story.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
Hellenic College

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

PHOTIOS' LETTER TO HIS BROTHER TARASIOS ON THE DEATH OF HIS DAUGHTER

by DESPINA WHITE

Epistolography is, without doubt, the field of literary achievement in which the Byzantines excelled greatly over their classical and post-classical prototypes. Men such as Theodore Stoudites, Photios, Michael Psellos, Maximos Planoudes, Gregory the Cypriot, and Cardinal Bessarion, to name but few of the most important, are authors of letters of greater literary value than their counterparts of earlier years such as Isocrates, Demosthenes, Libanius, Synesius, and others. In epistolography one can find, in the words of Ioannes Sykoutres, achievements of Byzantine superiority which belong to world literature.¹

In studying Byzantine epistolography one finds that there were two predominant schools of thought: one, the rhetorical epistolography of the time of the emperors and especially of the teacher Libanius, and secondly, the protochristian epistolography based on the writings of St. Paul.² In addition, the influence of the Church Fathers, that of the Cappadocians, is especially evident in the theological and journalistic letters.

Patriarch Photios of Constantinople (858-867 and 877-886), was a prolific letter writer of the ninth century. Today two hundred and sixty of his letters have been amassed and published.³ While Photios could be classified as belonging to the rhetorical school of epistolography,⁴ he injects in it a freshness and originality of the new Christianity as it appeared in the ninth century Byzantium. In a letter to the Metropolitan of Kyzikos, the influences on Photios' style can be understood by his discussion of his preferences among letter writers.⁵ The preference of the Patriarch falls to those written by Falarides of Acragantos and especially the letters of the Roman Brutus and of Julian. He respects and admires Libanius whose letters, he admits, could be used as prototypes for letter writers. If one, however, wished to search further for morality he recommends the letters of St. Basil and St. Gregory. Photios especially likes the ascetic muse of Isidoros of Pelousion.

Letter writing became the mirror of the rich world of the Fathers as well as a tool for teaching and for fighting heresies.

Letters were, on the other hand, used also to bring relief and consolation to those who suffered. Thus, in the following letter, Photios consoles his brother Tarasios for the loss of his newlywed daughter. In a style memorable for its clearness and forcefulness, it could be, in the words of professor Tornadakes, an example for its kind in universal literature.⁶ Indeed, it is a masterpiece of style and content.

This letter is not the kind a brother would write today in consolation, even if that brother were the Patriarch. This type of letter, however, was not unusual in Byzantium. Photios begins the letter by sympathizing with his brother, the grief-stricken father of a young and beautiful bride. By mourning with him, Photios wins his brother's attention. Among all the calamities that have befallen the nation and their family, Photios tells Tarasios, he considers the death of this young girl the worst calamity of all.⁷ At this time, Photios is in exile;⁸ deserted and alone himself he grieves with the father. But, he continues, did not their parent suffer greatly also? Did they not bury some of their children? And under what terrible conditions? But does not all end in death by the nature of man? Then why is his brother so grief-stricken?

Having consoled his brother enough, Photios suddenly changes his approach. Like the prophet from the Bible, he points his finger at his brother and talks to him: How do you dare question the will of God; how do you dare question his unfathomed grace and love for humanity? You say that it was not time for her to go? But who knows best when is the right time but God, the giver of life? You take it up to yourself to be the time-keeper of life? Photios proceeds to accuse the lamenting father.

The brilliance of Photios' extensive vocabulary, his knowledge of mythology and especially the scriptures are all evident in this beautiful letter. Also in abundant evidence is his use of imagery and references to nature, especially in the moving passage where the departed girl talks to her father trying to console him as she tells him how happy she is in this beautiful place called Paradise. Photios, somehow, anticipates the romanticists of the nineteenth century in his frequent references to nature.

Photios, however, with his vast knowledge of antiquity and literature, is always first a Christian. To him the idea of death should always be welcome. This life is only a transitory short stage, a necessary tearful passage, on the way to eternity. This is the stage where man comes in contact with sin, therefore the less

time one stays on this earth, the less he sins. The rewards are not here, but in Heaven, and we only have to cross this necessary stage, in order to arrive at the desirable.

The strong family affection of the Patriarch is evident in this letter. Neither his scholarship nor his patriarchate obliterate his deep feelings for his brother. If he could help, he tells his brother, he would fall on his knees and embrace the feet of Peter or Paul or any one who would restore the girl to her parents. But it is of no use. The only thing that remains is faith and obedience to God's will. The great example for us is Job, he adds. The guarantee of our own immortality, the Resurrection, is given by Photios as the final argument for the rejection of all grief over the death of a loved one.

The Letter⁹

Alas! Where is Elijah¹⁰ now? And where is Elisha?¹¹ And where is Peter,¹² or Paul,¹³ or any who were considered holy and saintly men? Then I would not even need a letter, just to kneel at the feet of one of them and seize his feet (because I am not worthy to touch his hands). I would not rise until the girl was restored to her parents. Now what? Even my banishment¹⁴ is insignificant in view of the misfortunes of our family.

Alas? I do need to write a letter, a letter attempting to soothe the pain of a brother upon the death of his daughter, who died childless and was unlucky in marriage because she had not quickly become a mother. Now all hope is lost that this girl's child would ever enter the house and rush to the open arms of the grand-parents, play and dance and talk with them in its babyish way. But while we hoped for more, we lost even what we already had.

How did the low and base snake ever creep into paradise?¹⁵ How did it persuade? Or how from that time until the present has the bitter goad of death continued? This wound came again upon us, sharper than an arrow, more fearful than a thunderbolt. And there lies the girl just in the flower of her youth, a sight painful and melancholy to the eyes of her parents.

While the flower of childhood was blooming, that same plant withered away at the very roots. While the girl was reaching maturity, the scythe of death already was plunged into her vitals, harvesting life from her. How much weeping fits such pain? How much groaning? How much wailing? The mouth keeps that long

and unwanted silence and her lips keep mute and not telling of the modesty or her good character, but instead keep withdrawn ready for the end.

What about the eyes? Alas for suffering that even conquers silence, and at the same time does not endure words. The eyes (how should I say it?) are empty of all tears and now they are closed forever. The cheeks, once suffused with the red color of life, are now a dark and lifeless color. Thus her face presents a terrible and fearsome sight to those who look upon her.

What evil power, what kind of demon shoots arrows against us? We are barely over our last mourning when yet another and greater befalls us;¹⁶ the former had a child still nursing on her breast, and this one would have become a mother if this evil had not come so fast. Whence come so many great wounds? Wounds from men, wounds from unknown sources. From everywhere come afflictions. We have become a scene of tragedy, and dancing among us are death, sorrow, grief and dejection, and every demon of evil. We have to presume, it seems, that the dance of Clotho with her spindles and her unlucky thread tangles our lives and supplies the plots of the tragic plays for the ill-fated performers.¹⁷

But what is happening to me? Where am I borne? I started to write a condolence and without knowing how, I was unintentionally carried away by the grief for the suffering and was transported to the opposite of my intentions. As I proceeded to the argument of my consolation I was brought to tears by thoughts of those in grief.

But let us get control of ourselves; let us not be submerged in the depth of sorrow. Many have perished from grief which destroys not only the body, but also devastates the soul. Let us not abuse the patient endurance of our parents. They have seen their children dead from deaths not even known to us, and I hope we will never know them.¹⁸ Their children experienced fire and water and pits and then, with the coming of the heavy and bitter exile, were deprived of all friends and relatives and simply from everything which brings comfort to the soul.¹⁹ They, nevertheless, accepted it with gratitude and they glorified Him who governs the affairs of man with a power beyond human reckoning.

Let us consider who we are. How were we created? Not from mortals as mortals? Are we not soon to die just as our own parents have? Where is my father? Where is my mother? Did they not for a little while play the game in life, and was not the

testimony of their martyrdom²⁰ a crown of patience for their sufferings as they were leaving the theater swiftly?²¹ And do not the kings and tyrants, immortal with their insolent brows, also sink into the domain of death? All human beings, public or private, old or young, man or woman are going to end in death; no one can escape his scythe.

We have not submitted to anything new, strange, or unnatural. She came as a mortal from a mortal womb, and in the mortal life, of natural law to the immortal kingdom she went. She did not leave behind her any children bewailing their orphanhood, and did not go away burdened with the care of her offsprings, a sting more bitter than death. Neither, she had much experience of the troubles of life. Nor did she ask for death which many often welcome after they have been surrounded by many inescapable misfortunes. She left the swift current of the transient world, while she was still close to her parents; she left while her mother's hands were still serving her. In the hands of her parents she left her spirit. Her body was mourned and laid in the grave with the proper ceremonies, along with the respect and common sense and blessings of many who pitied her. She went to a place where every sorrow and misery is absent. What more is necessary? When I think of this blessed girl my sorrow turns to joy, and I consider her blessed because of her departure; and the lamentations of her death, I convert to the glory of God, and the perplexity into blessedness. For by divine will, just as one would almost pray for it, she is free from this world.

[You will say] she did not live a long life. What is the difference if there are more or fewer days in our life, when all end at the gates of death? No person rejoices in the past; there is no future; the present, in which anyone might place pleasure, is but brief. Thus either a long or short life, since either looks at the present in a sense of pleasure only, makes equal and similar the pleasure of those who live to a very old age and those who are in the bloom of their youth. And it leads them both astray by the pleasure of the moment and gives neither a share in pleasure of the past or the future. Thus, seemingly it makes no difference if one lives a long or short time; rather there is a difference, because if there is no man who is completely free from sin, no man who can be sure of his actions, then if his life becomes shorter even by one day by which to escape this body of clay, then he has a shorter time to sin. Therefore, this makes me want to weep, that you mourn for the departed because [as you say] she swiftly escaped

the present; because she took so little part in the things that desecrate and that you consider a misfortune her utter purity when she goes to meet her betrothed in heaven.

But you will say, she went before her time. Do not let me hear such comments; to say those words is audacious and to think them is even more audacious. Before her time! What about when she was born and her mother's labor pains ceased; then why was it not thought that she came ahead of her time? But it was done then with God's consent and on time. When, however, she left to go to the Creator, then do we ourselves become the time-keepers? And while the Creator brings us on time, when he takes back to himself, then does he not know the right time? He who thickened the seed into flesh, molded it in the womb, brought it into the light, preserved it from infancy to childhood, until her marriage, until her perfect maturity. None of this was done out of time. When, however, He rewards her with immortal life, then only is it not the right time? Beware of using your tongue to defame God rather than honor Him. Beware of your wise conceits; the many tears and lamentations trouble the human heart, and you cannot believe that he has exchanged the corruptible for the incorruptible. Indeed, no one but him who would destroy the immortal spirit should lament her escape from the mortal body. Nor should we lament her, whom a heavenly bridegroom has married, but rather him who has buried the soul in dead hopes.

Yes, you will say, but she went before her parents. Why not? Would anyone wish her to suffer the pain of the death of her mother and father before her? That person does not show me the feeling of a father but the character of a stepmother; not the love of a mother or a father, who are only thinking of their own private satisfaction, and not that of the daughter, and inventing in the desire for the child, their own cure and pleasure.

What can be more terrible than to see the death of loved ones? She, however, left free from that suffering. Since there should be no sadness, then why are we wasting ourselves in grief?

If you were to go where the girl is now, she would take you by the hand, and with a cheerful and happy face she would kiss you and would tell you: Father! Why are you hurting yourselves? Why are you grieving as though I had suffered something bad? My lot is to live in Paradise, a place so delightful to see with the eyes, and even more delightful to enjoy it, and it is beyond all belief to experience it. I am in that Paradise, that first wonderful home of

ours, in which of old the first work of art was created by God's hand, where our forefathers enjoyed a pleasant and blessed life before the snake whispered. But now not even that crooked and wicked serpent has a place to creep in, not even words to fabricate and to whisper because here among us there is no one whose knowledge is not superior to all his crafts and skills. Nor any one needs to have his eyes opened nor to enjoy any greater desires because we are all wise here with divine and heavenly wisdom, with abundant and ineffable goodness. All our life here is a continuous feast and a celebration. More radiant than anything, in our incorruptible and purified bodies, we see God, and enjoy his inutterable and incomprehensible beauty. We are absolutely happy, and no one has too much of it.

We have as much happiness as we want, but the peak of love is the fullness of joy, and associated with that love is the power to enjoy it, which creates an ineffable and undemonstrable joy and happiness. Even now, as I am talking to you, a great and irresistible desire returns me to those things, and I could not express even the least of them. I hope [father] that you will come here some day with my dear mother, and then you will accuse me for saying too little about this place, and you will blame yourself for your grief, and for lamenting such blessings as mine.

For all these, my dear father, be happy and rejoice and think no more bad thoughts, so that you will not be hurt and be very bitterly weary on that account.

If this blessed daughter could tell you these and other things, would you not be ashamed, and stop your grief; and would you not be happy, and send her away happily? And when she would tell you these things would you not feel better and stop crying? But what about when our Common Maker and Lord shouts that, "he who believes in me even if he dies shall live,"²² and also "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, that God has prepared for those who love him."²³ When we do not believe we have no recourse but to grieve more. What good does that bring? And is it right?

Should not our thoughts be closer to what is fitting and profitable? Then are you not embarrassing this very well composed bride when you turn your manly pride into woman's tears. Should you not forsake this womanly weakness? Does laudatory and advantageous sympathy turn into that which is unreasonable and prejudicial? For what will happen to women if the men from

whom they expect to regain strength, grieve like women? Whence will they get their comfort? Whom shall we advise them to imitate after this? Are there any brave men to look up to? Do not let this happen to you! God forbid that you should experience anything unworthy of yourself or strange and alien to our chosen ancestors, or mention something even more important than the thing at hand. Let us not be borne into lamentations more than is fitting. Let us not behave like women in sorrow; we have appeared as men everywhere and in many very difficult trials. The Creator has taken his creation back to himself; but he has given more sons and daughters than he has taken away, and may they live long and well and be comfort to their parents. Shall you grieve over the past? Rather let those who are present be comforted.

Let us give thanks for those he has taken away, so that we may have a sure pleasure in enjoying and rejoicing in those he has given. Because it is good to have living successors, and we have them. Because it is good to offer the first fruits to the common creator and giver of all good things; we have given them. Before it was not clear which of the children were as an offering to God, and which should be reckoned as the ones to perpetuate the family. But now, if only we bring the offering cheerfully, no longer shall we vacillate between uncertainties and hope, but we shall be confirmed in strength.

For he never takes away without giving even more lavishly, and always for the greatest and most unexpected blessings he takes the least. But if we indulge in mourning as if we have been wronged, we insult the offering. But I for my part, I am not saying anything difficult, since I hope that you not spend the rest of your life in mourning and grief and sufferings which produce distress. And may the divine intention for me suit both my wishes and my hopes, and it does. He has given me that gift of free speech, as I just said, to bring you from dejection to thanksgiving.

Many things of recent and of old are examples for the good of the soul. Or rather to speak more truly, one's whole life is an example. It is easier for the man who has considered everything rationally to thrust away every sorrow. Is the thing I say too great, or is it a dreadful matter that one should grieve for the departed? I am not the one who says that; but I call upon the herald of this world, he who with his own familiar voice announces the heavenly decree: "But we would not have you ignorant brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope."²⁴ Paul is the one who

trumpets these words, who was educated in the heavenly school and who spread his gospel to the whole world; the mouth of Christ proclaims that to grieve for the departed befits the unbelievers, who disavow the hope of resurrection, who disbelieve in the sacred power of Christ.

But let us put off grief lest we appear guilty of these evils and actually hurt the child. For now the bosom of Abraham comforts her, and there in a little while we shall see her happy and rejoicing. If I, on the contrary, against the Master's decrees, mourn the child, I am driven from that beautiful vision. Do you long to behold the child? Cast the grief away from you; show yourself by what you give thanks for, worthy of comfort from heaven. But if you cherish the lamentations, we keep depriving ourselves of the thing we long the most. For there, in heaven, grief is not known; and the bridal chamber of joy and happiness does not tolerate any sorrow. Nor does He wish to receive any afflicted with tears, especially for those He has as the heirs of ineffable joy. The Creator had decided to destinate His creation for immortality. Let us not begrudge the child's happiness; nor let us even whisper against the judgment which we should admire. Let us not force the Master's Pride into a judgment of folly.

Once the child of the great King David was ill, and the illness pointed to the grave. The King considering the illness as a great misfortune, lay flat on his face, and with his tears tried to appease the divine, staying away from food and from any other care of his body. But when the child died, David, immediately forsook his grief. For before he had prayed that his offspring stay with him; but when he saw the Creator had decreed a departure, he did not venture to insult the Creator's judgment by grief. But, composing himself, he rose above sorrow, lifted up his voice in thanksgiving and went about his customary business.²⁵ This should be also our attitude.

Suppose a child is ill, or another relative, or some one of our friends, and the illness causes death. I ask God to let the illness pass, to grant that the loved one remain with those who love him. But if He Himself thinks that a change is better, is it not fitting to give thanks for what he has arranged, to accept what has been done, and not to mock the judgment of the Creator with lamentations and bewailings?

If, however, a demon is waiting to ambush us and is seeking Job again, and God permits his servant to contrive a trial and put to

the test the patience of His adversary, and He proclaims the opening of the arena for the contests in order to shame the opponent and to crown the contestant, there is no need for weariness in proclaiming virtue.²⁶ One does not declare a period of mourning at a time of triumph, nor a day of grief on the day of the games. I swear by this and those who are crowned with the wreaths of patience, and by the imperishable and radiant crowns themselves. Are not these prizes worthy of your noble soul, your sound judgment, and any other virtue?²⁷

Therefore, let us stand bravely; let us stand with courage and as soldiers of the heavenly King let us oppose the enemy. Let us not shame our Spectator, the Game Giver, and not let us strengthen the enemies' boldness by our complaints. Nor let us lose in the end what we have accomplished with our courage. Let us be brave, becoming good not by exciting the wrath of the enemy, and, winning in the end through patience, let the end in ourselves be checked. The fort is ready to attack as soon as he sees a man inclined to evil. Swiftly, on the other hand, he refrains from tempting when he sees a man firmly fixed in unshakeable courage. The giver of the crown is near, crowning the contestant with radiant wreaths in return for his victory. No longer does he consent to the foe's attacks, but he drives him further away, even if he should think to go on abusing us with all his own devices and plans. He replaces our pains many times over with prosperity and joy. And to all these things the incontrovertible witness is again, Job himself; even as we have shared in his afflictions, so too, we shall enjoy of his happiness, glory and splendor, both now and forever in the name of the ever virgin Mary, our glorious Lady, the Mother of God and of the Saints, Amen.

MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE

FOOTNOTES

1. *Probleme der byzantinischen Epistolographie* (Athens Actes de Ille Congres d'Etudes byzantines, 1932), p. 295.
2. Accordingly Wilhelm Schmid, "Zur antiken Stillehre aus Anlass von Proklos Chrestomathie," *Rheinisches Museum*, IL (1894), 152, dis-

tinguishes also two distinct schools of thought in the history of rhetoric in late antiquity. The one derived, according to Schmid from Isocrates and his school with an approach to literature through prose; the second school was somehow a branch of the Isocrateans who wished to excel in rhetoric.

3. It was not until 1601 that the first known collection of Photios' letters appeared, compiled by David Hoeschel. He published, with the *Bibliotheca* thirty-five letters selected from a MS collection belonging to Maximos Margunios, Bishop of Kythera. The whole title of this book, an edition of which this author was very lucky to encounter at the Vikelaiia Public Library, at Heraklion Crete, is as follows: "**Βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ Φωτίου. Librorum Quo Legit Photius Patriarcha, excerpta et censurae**, David Hoeschelius Augustaus primus edidit. Augustae Vindelicorum cum prinilegus S. Caes Maest (Oporiniana, 1568). Then underneath has the other date of 1601. The last part of this edition includes thirty-five letters of Photios.
4. G. L. Koustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photios," *Hellenika*, XVII (1962), 135. Professor Koustas points out that Photios' Greek was that of the school of Demosthenes, "the prose writer par excellence," p. 135. Photios in his writings and sermons made use of the attic dialect, often using established words and other times creating new words, thus making it difficult for his readers today to understand him. In fact one should be very well read in Attic literature in order to understand him.
5. Ioannes Valettas, **Φωτίου τοῦ Σοφωτάτου καὶ Ἀγιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἐπιστολαί** (London. D. Nutt, 1864), Epist. No. 233.
6. Niocolaos Tomadakes, **Βυζαντινὴ Ἐπιστολογραφία**, τομ. 3ος τῆς Εἰσαγωγῆς εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Φιλολογίαν (Athens, 1969), p. 59.
7. Photios is referring here to the Iconoclastic upheavals in the ninth century under the iconoclastic Emperors, Leo V (the Armenian) 813-820; Michael II, (820-829), and the last iconoclastic emperor, his son Theophilos (829-842).
8. It is evident from Photios' own words line 5 "even my banishment is insignificant. . ."
9. The translation of the letter is based on the text of Ioannes Valettas, (London, 1864) who based his on Richard Montaque ed. *Photii sanctissimi patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistolae* (London: Roger Daniel, 1651), and on the text in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*. In addition, the author of this translation consulted the MS of Ivron 684 (late sixteenth or early seventeenth century) which was made available to her through the Institute for Patristic Studies of Mone Vlatadon, Thessalonike. The MSS of Ivron and the MSS Montaque, believed to have used a tenth century MS, bear great similarity. There are no differences in the text, except the Ivron has more frequent punctuation than the text of Valettas. Also, in addition, the MS located in the Marciana library, No. 849, ff. 287v-291v was read and compared. Whenever the translation departs from the printed text of Valettas, the

word has been put in brackets. Changes of punctuation have not been as a rule noted. Scriptural references are limited to explicit quotations. The standard King James edition has been used for the quotations. The author has tried, with the best of her ability, to preserve the style of this most difficult Patriarch. This letter is No. 142 in Valettas, in *Patrologia Graeca*, C II, 969.

10. The one who raised from the dead the widow's son, I Kings 17 17-24.
11. He raised the dead child of the Shumerian woman, II Kings, 18 38
12. In Joppa Peter raised from the dead a disciple named Tabitha, Acts 9 36-43.
13. He raised from the dead the young man named Eutychios in Troas, Acts, 20 7-12.
14. It is clear from this reference that Photios was at that time in exile.
15. Photios makes a number of references to the snake who is always associated with evil or sin.
16. Tarasios must have lost another girl, a daughter married and with a child.
17. Photios' theme, that life is a scene of a tragedy, or the arena, and man the actor or the athlete are very numerous throughout his writings.
18. We know from the letters of Patriarch Photios to his brothers, that he had four brothers living, Sergios and Constantine who became spatharioi, Theodore, and Tarasios who became a patrician. We know also from references in letters that his parents martyred during the iconoclastic upheavals. Probably some other members of his family, maybe other brothers or sisters had died during these upheavals unable to withstand the hardships.
19. His family and his friends for Photios were the most valuable elements to sustain him in the hardships he had to endure.
20. Another reference to the iconoclastic upheavals of the first part of the ninth century.
21. The theme of the crowns, as rewards and the theater as life where men act their part while passing through is evident here in this passage again.
22. John II 25.
23. I Cor. 2 9.
24. I Thessal. 4 13.
25. II Samuel 12 15-24.
26. The theme again of the arena, the contests, the crowns and the contestant is ever-present.
27. Demosthenes said to the Athenians a similar speech while trying to bring them back from apathy and make them fight against King Philip and the Macedonian armies.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

**RELEVANCE AND THE ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN
THEOLOGICAL ENTERPRISE:
A SYMBOLIC PARADIGM ON WELTANSCHAUUNG
By JAMES STEVE COUNELIS**

Orthodox Christianity as Weltanschauung:

Weltanschauung is what the Orthodox theological enterprise is all about. I take the Orthodox theological enterprise to be involved in the systematic study of Revelation so that the prophetic and teaching office of the Orthodox Church is operative. I take the theological enterprise of the Orthodox Church to be concerned and involved with the "Good News" being taught clearly and correctly. I take the Orthodox theological enterprise to be involved deeply with the eschaton and theosis of every man, woman, and child, for that is the sole imperative of the Christian commitment. In a fundamental and existential sense, every committed Orthodox Christian is a theologian, a disciple of Christ the Logos.

In what sense is Orthodox Christianity Weltanschauung? This is a fair question because Orthodox theology traditionally does not speak in these terms. Weltanschauung intends to denote a world view that encompasses the daily living of the Orthodox Christian so that the objective and phenomenal world does not appear as meaningless chaos and that man's physical obliteration by death is copable and comprehensible. The fabric of Orthodox Christianity is a kind of seamless robe and the elements going into warp and woof are discernible.

One way to describe the seamless robe of Orthodox Christianity is through sacred history. This has been done many times, be it in the Old Testament, the Gospels and the Book of Acts, the synaxaria, or histories written by church historians. A second and third means of describing Orthodox Christianity as a whole are through the autobiography of a saint and a personal experience in a monastic community. All of these provide valid knowledge and experiences in Orthodox Christianity as Weltanschauung, as a world view.

Permit the introduction of another method of understanding Orthodox Christianity as a world view, a method not so poetic as

those formerly cited. This method is a formal device that synthesizes Orthodox Christianity but allows for its analysis, as it were, by sagittal section. Applying Aristotle's holistic analytical framework of causal categories, Orthodox Christianity is seen as a whole through its integrated parts. Chart No. 1 presents Orthodox Christianity as Weltanschauung. Data on Orthodox beliefs and behaviors are organized within this holistic framework. The data are real and exemplary rather than detailedly comprehensive. This chart provides an objective understanding of Orthodox Christianity. In fact, this pattern provides an useful template for the comparative study of Weltanschauungen.

CHART NO. 1:

AN ARISTOTELIAN MODEL OF WELTANSCHAUUNG, PRINCIPLES AND DATA IN THE EXAMPLE OF ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY

ARISTOTLE'S CAUSAL CATEGORIES	ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY AS <u>WELTANSCHAUUNG</u>	
	GENERAL PRINCIPLES	ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN DATA
MATERIAL CAUSE	COSMOLOGY	(1) Natural World/Demiurge God (2) Creedal Propositions (3) God/Man Relations (4) Church Militant/Church Triumphant
FORMAL CAUSE	ETHOS	(1) Religious/Ethnotic Values and Practice (2) State/Church Relations (3) Law Civil and Canon (4) Priesthood of Clergy and Laity (5) Vocations, Individuality & Commitment (6) Agape as Moral Law (7) Decalogue

ARISTOTLE'S CAUSAL CATEGORIES	ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY AS <u>WELTANSCHAUUNG</u>	
	GENERAL PRINCIPLES	ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN DATA
EFFICIENT CAUSE	DYNAMICS	(1) Sacred/Profane History (2) Revelation Epiphany of God-Holy Trinity (3) Miracles & Mysteries (Sacraments) (4) Prayer & the Mystical (5) Human Psyche· Man's Will (6) Satan
FINAL CAUSE	<u>ESCHATON</u> OR <u>TELOS</u>	(1) Man's Theosis (2) Man's Salvation at Second Judgment

Pentecost and Relevance:

To fulfill the Great Commission of Christ required the historical fact of Pentecost, that is, the delivery of the "Good News" to each man in his own tongue and in his own historical setting. To do this, the Church takes people where they are. She teaches Christ Crucified to them in their own tongues. She does so wherever men make their homes and labor for bread. The historical hellenization and latinization of the Christian message are evidences of this pentecostal process. So is the missionary work of Cyril and Methodius among the Slavs. So is the current Orthodox mission work in Mexico, Uganda, Japan, Korea, and Alaska.

But the pentecostal process is more than linguistic. It is the imperative of the prophetic and teaching office of the Church Militant to witness Christ to all, everywhere, and for all time until the Second Coming. The recurring educational problem of the Orthodox Church for all times and places is relevance, meaning, the effective communication and connecting of the Christ to a person at a given time and place. Since the time when Jesus walked on earth, much has changed His world from its less populous, primarily agrarian, and technologically inefficient character. An agrarianly biased Gospel must be translated into an

urban Christian Weltanschauung for a post-industrial society. That was the historical task of the theological enterprise of the past, to wit, Paul's letters, the Greek and Latin fathers, and the missionaries of the Church. That is the historical and creative task of our theological thinkers and doers in the Orthodox Church today.

To bring Christ crucified by word and deed to contemporary secular men requires taking the theological and dogmatic teachings given to us by our fathers, martyrs, and confessors and building bridges of relevance to critical points in the accepted Weltanschauung of current men. These new bridges of relevance may require the redesign and rebuilding of some of the theological foundations laid in the past. The superstructure of these new bridges of relevance must be embedded firmly in Revelation and in our contemporary knowledge and experience so that they can hold the burden of the design of new theological thinking. Though I cannot prophesy the shape of future Orthodox Christian theology, I feel sure that few of the items given in Chart No. 1 will be immune to change. Christ is the same forever. His message of salvation will be communicated by the creative pentecostal process of theologizing as done by His disciples in past eras and cultures.

Method of Studying Relevance in Theology:

In his very able and persuasive book *The Invisible Religion*, Thomas Luckman documents the dialectical relation between man's personal identity and Weltanschauung. His phenomenalist and sociological analyses indicate that the theological ideal of perfect congruence between the "official model of religion" or Weltanschauung and the person's and/or society's operative Weltanschauung can never be fully realized. Luckman's repertoire of reasons can all be summed under the fact that men as persons and societies are open systems of n-dimensions, which systems evolve over time in accord with thermodynamic patterns. The discrepancy between the theological ideal and the operative real is the fertile source of all relevance problems.

The systematic study of Weltanschauungen and their problems in relevance is set in information and systems theory, the sociology of knowledge and the history of the arts and sciences. But to rise above the minutiae of historical, sociological, and psychological data to seek common patterns is necessary. In this context and quite at variance with general theological discourse, this seeking of common patterns will be done by considering the

elements given in Chart No. 1 as basic vectored elements of facts and constructing symbolic propositions from the vectors. The syntax of these propositions is to define the relationships among the cited vectored elements. The abstracting capacity of symbolic propositions provides a useful method for distinguishing forests and trees. The process to be used here is to define a *Weltanschauung* by symbolic proposition that contains all the vectored elements in particular syntactic relations. Subsequently, the generic patterns in relevance problems will be seen in terms of this basic proposition's syntax of vectored elements. This symbolic paradigm of *Weltanschauung* will be applicable at two levels, viz., the individual person and the society in which he lives.

Weltanschauung Defined:

Holistically understood from Chart No. 1, all world views contain four structural vectored elements. These are: (1) cosmology, designated by the letter C; (2) ethos, designated by the letter E; (3) dynamics, designated by the letter d; (4) eschaton or telos, designated by the letter T.

By cosmology (C), reference is made to the vector of objective observations people make about their world and the pattern of meanings they impose upon them. For instance, the Copernican system, Nirvana, the pantheon of classical Greece and Rome, the upper and lower jaw curricula of the Polynesian *whara-wananga*, the nitrogen cycle, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 A.D., RNA and DNA, and the Hawthorne effect reflect cosmological patterns imposed upon objectively observed realities at a given time and place by particular men. These imposed "pictures" carry cognitive and affective meanings.

By ethos (E), reference is made to the vector of valuational methods, values and axiological structures attached to things and assigned to human behaviors. Political loyalty, the aesthetics of Bauhaus architecture and furniture, the nation state system, Aztec human sacrifices, mysticism, and the sacramental system of salvation are illustrative of ethos (E), each embodying value and moral practice. Axiological rankings concerned with imperatives such as the just, equity and rights, excellence, the beautiful, humanity and the commonweal, mercy, and the good are included in ethos (E). Among the valuational methods included would be those inspired by philosophical procedures, games theory, simulation processes, and the optimizing equations of linear programming.

Dynamics (d) refers to the vector containing the principles of internal motion that make the world view function as a psychic, social, and physical reality. One could include the three common laws of thermodynamics, Freud's idego-superego system of personality dynamics, Heisenberg's principle of indeterminacy, Newton's laws of motion and the Keynesian multiplier within this vector. In Orthodox Christian data, dynamics (d) are reflected in the observed facts of the Epiphany in Trinity, miracles, man's psyche and will, sacred and profane history, Satan, prayer, angels, the mystical, and natural law.

Telos (T) refers to the vector containing ordained purposes, goals, and the "ultimate." Among prominent examples of telos are Jefferson's "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" phrase in the Declaration of Independence, the goals in the Hippocratic Oath, the purposes of the canons of the American Bar Association, the continuation of the species through its reproductive system, and purpose in basic research. For the Orthodox Christian, telos (T) is in man's theosis and salvation at the Second Coming which is his ultimate end. Life becomes purposeful and his ultimate end appears attainable through faith.

Within the physical manifolds of time and space that is man's environment (Z), world views are comprehensive in scope but never total in detail. By hypothesis, science, or commonsense, men impose order and boundaries upon the chaos observed before them. Men assign meaning to their structured views in order to live the observed realities around them without fear and paranoia. The stark reality of death--the obvious physical dissolution of physical man--is most feared. Men cope with death through telos (T) in their world view.

In addition, world views are never complete and none is a totally closed system. Further, no Weltanschauung is ever rigorously structured and none is ever ontologically pure. The nature of man, an open systems object of n-dimensions, does not permit it. Some world views are theistic as Orthodox Christianity while others are non-theistic as the radical Marxist or secular humanist. Some are eclectic, idealist, rationalist, realist, or empirical. Some are oblitative of man's nature and others are integrative. All Weltanschauungen evolve over time and generations.

Having defined the objective elements in any Weltanschauung, Symbolic Proposition No. 1 presents a symbolic definition or

paradigm of Weltanschauung:

$$W =_{\text{def}} f Z [(C \cap E) / d] \quad T. \quad [1]$$

Symbolic Proposition No. 1 reads: A Weltanschauung (W) is defined to be a function (f) of the intersect (n) between the cosmology (C) and the ethos (E) held and practiced by persons (d) in the presence of particular historical observables in their milieu (Z), the Weltanschauung leading to particular goals or telos (T). It is very clear that every world view (W) is bound in time and space (Z).

Seven Generic Types of Relevance Problems:

There are seven generic types of relevancy problems common to all world views. These generic problems of relevancy rest in the objective fact that functional relationships exist among the vectored elements, viz., Z, C, E, d, and T. When there are traceable, significant, logical and substantive connections among the vectored elements, the relevance of each element to the other is established. The absence of such coherence manifests dysfunction and thus a lack of relevance is obtained. Relevance among the several vectored elements is demonstrable in an empirically objective sense.

For summarizing brevity, Chart No. 2 presents the generic types of relevancy problems. Their generic character is demonstrated objectively by a symbolic proposition for each class of relevancy problems. An English explanation for each symbolic proposition is provided. An able student of historical theology or comparative sociology of religions is able to demonstrate each type handily. A set of examples from contemporary American Orthodox Christianity are posited as vivid illustrations. These seven types of relevancy problems provide another useful template for study of relevance across several Weltanschauungen.

CHART NO. 2:

SEVEN GENERIC TYPES OF RELEVANCE: EXAMPLES OF DYSFUNCTIONS IN AMERICAN ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY

Weltanschauung: $W = \text{def } f \ Z \ [\ (CnE) / d] \rightarrow T$		
GENERIC TYPES OF RELEVANCE	EXPLANATIONS	EXAMPLES
<u>TYPE NO. 1</u> $Z \ (CnE) / d$	a continuity/discontinuity between the historical observables in the environment (Z) and the Weltanschauung (W) as a whole [$(CnE) / d$],	(1) Phyletistic Orthodox Churches in U.S.A / Universalistic command of the Ascension. (2) American democratic decision-making processes/ the monarchical character of Orthodox ecclesial governance and behavior.
<u>TYPE NO. 2</u> $Z_c \ C/d$	a continuity/discontinuity between a cosmological fact in the environment (Z_c) and the cosmological pattern (C/d) imposed upon that fact by the Weltanschauung (W),	(1) The biology of human conception/Biblical account of the Annunciation (2) The chemistry of wine, bread, and water/the doctrine of transubstantiation
<u>TYPE NO. 3</u> $Z_e \ E/d$	a continuity/discontinuity between a human behavioral fact in the environment (Z_e) and the valuational pattern (E/d) imposed upon that fact by the Weltanschauung (W),	(1) Linguistic dysfunctions in ethnic American Orthodox Churches/the Message of Pentecost. (2) Human language learning/the Apostle's foreign language facility after Pentecost

Weltanschauung. $W =_{\text{def}} f \ Z \ [\ (CnE) / \ d] \rightarrow T$		
GENERIC TYPES OF RELEVANCE	EXPLANATIONS	EXAMPLES
<u>TYPE NO. 4</u> C/d E/d	a continuity/discontinuity between a cosmological principle (C/d) and a valuational principle (E/d) with a given Weltanschauung (W) ;	(1) The lack of parity and equity of laymen to clergy of all ranks in ecclesial order and justice/the anthropology of the Orthodox Church. (2) Post-ordination marriages of clergy of all ranks/ Orthodox canonical injunction against such post-ordination marriages.
<u>TYPE NO. 5</u> Z · T	a continuity/discontinuity between the historical observables in the environment (Z) and the greater ends of Weltanschauung (W) ,	(1) American legal sanction for abortion/the commandment not to kill. (2) USSR militant atheistic policy and acts against religion/the Russian Orthodox Church's theism leading to man's theosis and salvation.
<u>TYPE NO. 6</u> Z : d	a continuity/discontinuity between the historical observables in the environment (Z) and a dynamic principle (d) in the Weltanschauung (W) ;	(1) Post-Lausanne Treaty repression of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by the Turkish Government/theodicy. (2) Man's physical death/the dogma of life-after-death.
<u>TYPE NO. 7</u> T : d	a continuity/discontinuity between the greater ends (T) of Weltanschauung (W) and a dynamic principle (d) in the Weltanschauung (W) .	(1) The imperative to increase and multiply/ the psychic incapacity to bear children. (2) Love one another/personal hatred.

Knowing that Weltanschauungen are bound to time and place and that relevance is the crux of theologizing, all problems of relevancy can be seen as resolvable through creative and timely theological thinking. The template of these symbolic propositions aids in giving substance and rigor to theological discourse. Orthodox theology provides objective evidence that great theology comes into being with the seized opportunity to resolve significant problems of relevancy. Great theology is evidence of the pentecostal process in history. Theologizing is the on-going history of Pentecost--where and when men of conscience and faith are always open to God's Revelation, always open to new human possibilities of salvation within God's economy, always open to the Paraclete and His love.

Theologizing:

The historical observables, *Z*, are given in the cultural and historical context of the Church Militant. These observables are existential facts, fully resistant to change through any known exertable efforts available to the theological enterprise.

But Weltanschauungen, such as Orthodox Christianity, have an ontology quite different from that of historical fact. World views are intellectual constructs which men impose upon reality in order to provide system and meaning. World building is theologizing work. World building is the theologizing work of the whole Church. The cosmological and ethotic elements in any Weltanschauung are least resistant to change. Men are open systems who change their ideas about the nature of the world, its meaning and its values. Orthodox theology is no exception as its history attests. The human enterprise of Orthodox theology, whether it be individually or conciliarly defined, must respond openly to resolve the dysfunction of irrelevance between Orthodox Christianity and the real world of this particular time and place.

In his insightful book *A Rumor of Angels*, Peter L. Berger describes well the range of responses which churches take in their relation to modernity. Lest the Orthodox Church atrophies into the irrelevant contradiction of being a universalistic sect or dissolve herself into modern secularistic humanism, the Orthodox Christian must be true to both his conscience and his heritage. He has a conscience for heritage which provides him an historical roadmap to where the Church has been and thus he need not

attempt to re-invent the wheel. He has a heritage of conscience which provides him the wisdom to know where to go and the courage to get there.

Today, the Orthodox Church slowly (perhaps too slowly) is pacing herself toward a limited and controlled accommodation with modernity, an *aggiornamento*, if you will. This means that Orthodox theological thinkers and doers, as leaders of the pentecostal process of theologizing, are involved in a bargaining process with modern thought and conditions. But creative theologians will not concentrate on the details of such a bargain. They have larger fish to fry. Through great theological discourse, creative Orthodox Christian theologians will concentrate on creating new theological paradigms, as Thomas S. Kuhn demonstrated for the sciences in his brilliant volume, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Thus a strong and relevant Orthodox Christianity will be constructed for the twenty-first century. I look forward to new Cyrils, new Origenes, new Basils, new Gregories, new Johns and new Athanasii who will do the job, be they cleric or lay and regardless of their training. I look forward to a new breed of Orthodox theological thinkers and doers whose breadth of education, catholicity of mind, and commitment of soul will lead the whole Church to a broader grasped understanding of the Epiphany than that provided through persons trained presently in narrowly specialized curricula, be they in theology or not.

The contemporary Orthodox theological enterprise is international in scope and concern. Certainly, the Ecumenical Movement and Vatican II are significant educating influences. Inter-church contacts and ecclesial diplomacy are more frequent today. Their effects, however, are quite superficial at the parish level. Further, the matters of relevancy for the Orthodox Christian varies from one national church to another, from one patriarchate to another. Hence, I anticipate the Orthodox theological enterprise to move at different rates all over the world.

The Orthodox Church has been conservative. Nonetheless, she has many advantages conducive to the entertainment and induction of change. One of these is that she has few conciliar dogmas with which to cope. Another advantage is the category of *theologoumena*, a kind of root cellar which contains open questions for continuing inquiry and dialogue. A third advantage is the historical adaptability of the Orthodox Church, making a home for herself in a wide spectrum of social systems. Great

flexibility is in the nature of the Orthodox Church, given her willingness and creativity to use it.

Theologizing Clergy and Laity:

The Orthodox Church has a great wealth of Orthodox lay communicants who are professional leaders trained in fields other than theology and its related areas. And yet, the Church has yet to involve them in her pentecostal service of theologizing and her ecclesial diplomacy in any significant and measurable way. The Orthodox theological enterprise views itself as a guild, somewhat closed. And given the current expansive character of human knowledge, no one guild of professionals contains within itself the totality of competence in human knowledge and art. Nor can the Orthodox theological enterprise hope to influence the centers of sciences and the arts through isolation.

Direct involvement of the priesthood of the laity, the *laos theou*, in theologizing is their right and duty. The pentecostal work of relating the Christ to the modern world is within the ken of these strong and creative people. Theological discourse is too important an enterprise to be left to religious professionals in the Church. The Orthodox theological enterprise in the United States and abroad needs to open its door widely. It needs to invite and to engage these thinkers and doers in the work of world building and salvation. Each can learn from the other in creative and benefiting ways. The pentecostal process of theologizing and the prophetic office of teaching the "Good News" to all everywhere rest with those who care, be they cleric or lay. The imperative to theologize and to teach has been upon us all since the Ascension. That imperative is upon us all until the Second Coming.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

William K. Medlin and Chrestos G. Patrinelis. **Renaissance Influences and Religious Reforms in Russia: Western and Post-Byzantine Impacts on Culture and Education, 16th and 17th Centuries.** With a forward by Sir Steven Runciman. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1971. Pp. 179. Paper

The authors have produced a short but very useful and important book in an area which has not attracted very much attention from historians. This is more true in English where very little has been written on post-Byzantine cultural and religious influences in Russia. Hopefully this excellent study will serve as a catalyst which will help produce many other works in this neglected but important area, and will serve as an example of collaboration. William K. Medlin of the University of Michigan has written an important book in the same field, **Moscow and East Rome** (Geneva, 1952), while Chrestos G. Patrinelis of the Medieval Archives of the Academy of Athens has written widely in the history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Ottoman period.

The authors divide their study into two parts: 1) Cultural Relations between the Eastern Church and Moscow, and 2) Greek and West European Influences in Orthodox Ruthenia in Church, Schools, and Society.

Part one is one half the length of part two and discusses the role of various Greeks and in particular that of Maximos the Greek in Russia, as well as the question of Greek-Russian ecclesiastical relations from the middle of the fifteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century.

We note that emerging Russian nationalism was able to make use of the Council of Florence to cut itself off from Constantinople and chose to interpret the fall of the City a short time later as a justification for its action, ignoring the fact that the "union" had been almost unanimously repudiated by the Byzantines, and within the year of its signing. Yet the resumption of relations was initiated by the Russians themselves in the person of Grand Prince Vasili II who sought Greek scholars for translation purposes. That the Greeks had not been totally "forgiven," however, is illustrated in part by the tragic career of Maximos the Greek, the invited translator, who was imprisoned in Russia and treated as a criminal for over thirty years. Nevertheless, Maximos, canonized by the Russians after his death, proved to be "a forerunner of cultural reform and social change. . . His residence in Russia marked the beginning of vigorous crises and a profound intellectual fermentation in the lands of Orthodox Russia."

But Maximos, the authors point out, was only the beginning of a long line of Greeks who, despite their own *rayah* status under the Ottoman Turks, continued to make solid contributions to the Russians and offered significant services. One only has to recall such names as Patriarch Hieremias II, Patriarch Meletios Pegas, Patriarch Theophanes, Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris, Patriarch Dositheos, and many others of lesser rank.

In part two, the same chronological period is surveyed but the scene shifts to Southwestern Russia where we have Latin as well as Greek influences competing with one another.

The story of this cultural conflict is well told as is the Latin attempt through the institution of the "Unia" to convert the Orthodox living in the

Polish-Lithuanian kingdom to the allegiance of the pope. The Orthodox responded with the formation of "brotherhoods" led by such laymen as Prince Constantine Ostrozhsui. But the dominant figure in this period of religious controversy and cultural fermentation is that of Metropolitan Peter Moghila "who accomplished more than any single leader in Rus'. . .to preserve and rebuild the national institutions in Central Russia."

In conclusion, it should be said that this is a very interesting and suggestive book that can be profitably read by all those interested in the cultural and religious history of Russia as well as by students of Byzantium and of the Great Church of Christ.

N. M. VAPORIS
Hellenic College

Constantine Carvarnos. **St. Macarios of Corinth. Modern Orthodox Saints, 2.** Belmont, Massachusetts Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1972. Pp. ix, 188. \$2.75, Paper.

Professor Cavarnos' book follows the same style and format as his **St. Cosmas Aitolos**. In the "Introduction," he narrates the life of Makarios and rightly emphasizes the latter's writings and attempts to achieve religious reform through education.

The author includes a sufficient sampling from the spiritual writings of Makarios in order to induce us to read Makarios for ourselves.

The book is well written and attractive, yet despite Makarios' importance there is apparently little biographical data available. Perhaps this is why Dr. Cavarnos includes a translation of Makarios' life written by Athanasios Parios, a friend of the Saint and a collaborator in the religious movement.

This reviewer would have preferred that Professor Cavarnos had detached himself a bit from the "hagiographical" style, enough to have discussed Makarios in a wider historical context. In this regard some of the historical material in the footnotes could very well have been included and elaborated upon in the text.

Nevertheless, we should be grateful to the author for introducing such an important religious personality to an English speaking audience. We wish him well in his forthcoming volumes on Seraphim of Sarov and Nektarios of Aghia.

N. M. VAPORIS
Hellenic College

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XVIII

NUMBERS 1 & 2

SPRING - FALL 1973



Published by the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College
Brookline, Massachusetts

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XVIII

NUMBERS 1 & 2

SPRING-FALL 1973



Published by the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College
Brookline, Massachusetts

Ideas and opinions expressed in any Article appearing in this REVIEW are those of the Author of the Article, and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editors

Copyright 1973, Hellenic College

Published by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College
50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U.S.A

Printed in The United States of America

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Official Publication of the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College

○

THE MOST REV ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, Chairman, Board of Trustees
THE RT REV BISHOP IAKOVOS of Apameia, President
THE REV STANLEY S HARAKAS, Dean

○

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor
THE REV. NOMIKOS MICHAEL VAPORIS
Associate Editor
THE REV GEORGE J. TSOUMAS

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
GEORGE S. BEBIS
THE VERY REV. MAXIMOS AGHIORGOUSSIS
THE REV THEODORE G. STYLIANOPOULOS
DIMITRI ZAHAROPOULOS
ALBERT STONE, JR.
THE REV. GEORGE KARAHALIOS

Business Manager
THE REV. JAMES G CARELLAS

○

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

MILTON V. ANASTOS (University of California, Los Angeles)
GEORGE G ARNAKIS (University of Texas)
PETER CHARANIS (Rutgers University)
DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS (Stockton State College)
DENO J. GEANAKOPLOS (Yale University)
GEORGE A PANICHAS (University of Maryland)
JOHN E. REXINE (Colgate University)
PETER TOPPING (University of Cincinnati)



THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is a publication for the exchange of scholarly papers and reviews in the fields of Biblical Studies, Orthodox Theology, Church History, Byzantine History, and related Classical, Archaeological, and Philosophical Studies.

A subscription to the REVIEW costs seven dollars per annum. The price of a single number is four dollars.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, requests for advertising and subscriptions, and notices of change of address should be directed to the Editor of THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146.

All MSS submitted for consideration by the REVIEW should be typewritten double-spaced; and all notes and documentation should be separately paged. Articles are approved for publication, or rejected, by the Editorial Boards. Rejected articles will be returned to the Author only if the latter has supplied a self-addressed stamped envelope.

The REVIEW is published twice yearly, Spring and Fall, by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146. It is indexed in Historical Abstracts, Religious and Theological Abstracts, and The Index to Religious Periodical Literature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

The Libri Carolini and the Image Controversy STEPHEN GERO.	7
Relevance and the Orthodox Christian Theological Enterprise A Symbolic Program on Weltanschauung JAMES STEVE COUNELIS	35
Photios' Letter to His Brother Tarasios on the Death of His Daughter DESPINA WHITE	47
God's Infinity and Man's Mutability: Perpetual Progress According to Gregory of Nyssa EVERETT FERGUSON	59
Michael Psellos on Man and His Beginning GEORGE KARAHALIOS	79
Apophatic Theology and Divine Infinity in St. Gregory of Nyssa ROBERT S. BRIGHTMAN	97

BOOK REVIEWS:

Ἡ Αἵρεσις τοῦ Filioque [The Heresy of the Filioque], by Spyridon Bilalis Reviewed by CONSTANTINE N. TSIRPANLIS	115
Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View, by Georges Florovsky Reviewed by CONSTANTINE N. TSIRPANLIS	116
Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἀχρίδος. [Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Ochrid], by Gerasimos I. Konidares Reviewed by NICHOLAS G. ITSINES	116

6 THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Renaissance Influences and Religious Reforms in Russia Western and Post-Byzantine Impacts on Culture and Education, 16th and 17th Centuries, by William K Medlin and Chrestos G. Patrinelis Reviewed by N. M. VAPORIS	118
St. Macarios of Corinth. Modern Greek Orthodox Saints, by Constantine Cavarnos Reviewed by N. M. VAPORIS	119
Ἡ Ἀρχαία Κύπρος εἰς τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς Πηγάς. [Ancient Cyprus in Greek Sources], by Kyriacos Hadjioannou Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS	120
Justinian II of Byzantium, by Constance Head Reviewed by DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS	123
Anna Comnena, by Rae Dalven Reviewed by DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS	124
Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸ Ἄσμα Ἀσμάτων. [Commentary to the Song of Songs], by Panagiotis N. Trempelas Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS	125
Νέα Σμύρνη. Μία Ἑλληνικὴ Ὁδύσσεια τοῦ 18ου αἰῶνα. by E. P. Panagopoulos Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS	126
Οἱ Περιπέτειες τοῦ Θεοῦ Πλάτωνα. [The Adventures of Uncle Plato], by Theoano Papazoglou Margaritis Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS	129
Οἱ Βασικοὶ Θεσμοὶ Διοικήσεως τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων Πατριαρχείων Μετὰ Ἱστορικῶν Ἀνασκοπήσεων. [The Fundamental Administrative Principles of the Orthodox Patriarchates with a Historical Review], by Barnabas Tzortzatos Reviewed by GEORGE S. BEBIS	130
BOOKS RECEIVED	133
SUPPLEMENT	
Code (Γ') Gamma of the Ecumenical Patriarchate NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS	S-3

Georges Florovsky. **Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View**, Vol. I. Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Co., 1972. Pp 127. \$6.35.

This is volume I of the **Collected Works** of the leading Orthodox theologian Father Georges Florovsky.

The volume contains seven of his essays, which have been previously published in English and German periodicals. The titles of these articles are "The Lost Scriptural Mind", "Revelation and Interpretation", "The Catholicity of the Church", "The Church Her Nature and Task", "The Function of Tradition in the Ancient Church", "The Authority of the Ancient Councils and the Tradition of the Fathers", "St. Gregory Palamas and the Tradition of the Fathers". All are of profound theological and historical insight. They try to clarify, re-evaluate and set in their proper historical context difficult problems like Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Freedom and Authority in the Church, the meaning of Chalcedon and of the Councils generally in the Early Church, the meaning of Tradition and Patristic Theology, the meaning of the "Age" of the Fathers, the legacy of Byzantine Theology.

It is with great interest and anxiety that the historian and the theologian anticipate the appearance of the subsequent volumes of the **Collected Works** of Fr. Florovsky, which will be published in English by Nordland Publishing Co., and will contain his articles in Slavic studies as well as in Church History and Theology. These articles have previously appeared in Russian, German, French, Bulgarian, Czech, Serbian, Swedish and English. Included in the **Collected Works** will be his two major works on the Church Fathers (**The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century** and **The Byzantine Fathers from the Fifth to the Eighth Century**).

Undoubtedly, the publication of Fr. Florovsky's works in English will mark a major event in and immeasurable contribution to the field of Byzantine History and Theology.

CONSTANTINE N. TSIRPANLIS
New York City

GERASIMOS I. KONIDARES, Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἀχρίδος [Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Ochrid]. Athens 1967. Pp. 80.

The study is a highly scholarly paper divided into three sections. The first deals with the origins of the Archdiocese of Ochrid, the second contains parallel tables from the tenth and eleventh century *Notitiae Episcopatum*, and the third gives a broad summary of Ochrid's history as an Archdiocesan See.

The history of Bulgaria and northwestern Macedonia in the late tenth and eleventh centuries is quite complicated and confusing. For this reason the

origins of the Archbishopric of Ochrid are not precisely known to us. According to the author, Ochrid appears as a Patriarchal See in the beginning of the eleventh century during the last years of Samuel's reign (d. 1014) (p. 65). This state of affairs was changed by Basil II Bulgaroktonos after his brilliant victories against Samuel. He degraded Ochrid to an archdiocese, and it appears as such in his first decree in 1020 (p. 12 n. 9). This is indeed the only certain thing the author can say as to its origin, whose archbishop bore the title "Archbishop of Ochrid and all Bulgaria" even after the creation of the Archbishoprics of Tirnovo (1185) and Péc (1219) (pp. 17, 19).

Dr. Konidares goes on to say that Ochrid at this time had thirty-one dioceses under its jurisdiction, which made it one of the larger archbishoprics. Apparently, twelve of these had belonged formerly to various metropolitans of Northern Greece (tables pp. 26-29). These metropolitans were quite uneasy about the deprivations and Basil II issued a second decree, stating that he only returned to Ochrid what had belonged to her during the reigns of the Bulgar Tsars Peter (927-69) and Samuel (976-1014). This was a fallacious justification claimed by Archbishop John of Ochrid (p. 70). Although Basil II accepted this claim, it should be noted that his motivation may have been political as well, for despite his ruthlessness in the field of battle his policy was moderate and sensible. In any case, the metropolitans regained their dioceses during the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118).

As it is widely known, Ochrid flourished in the late eleventh century under Archbishop Theophylaktos and in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century under Demetrios Chomatianos. But with the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Ochrid along with Tirnovo and Péc lost their autonomy and were made subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate until the nineteenth century (p. 74). This was, of course, the policy of the Ottomans.

The episcopal catalogues of the tenth-eleventh century in parallel tables comprise a very helpful source in this informative study. Here we find the catalogues of Leo VI, the Wise and his patriarch Nicholas Mystikos (ca. 906), the *Nova Tactica* of Constantine Porphyrogenetos, those of John Tzimiskes, the *Notitia* Two and Three in Parthey's list, as well as the three decrees of Basil II establishing the Archdiocese of Ochrid. Included in this section is part of Codex 1372 of the National Library of Athens published here for the first time (pp. 32-61).

The study is enlightening and well documented, despite some inconsistencies such as the theories concerning the date of Ochrid's origins as an archbishopric. In the case at hand, the author first is somewhat indefinite (pp. 17, 21, 12 n. 9) and then he affirmatively settles for the year 1019 (p. 68). Dr. Konidares has undoubtedly made a noteworthy contribution in the history of the Archdiocese of Ochrid.

NICHOLAS G. ITSINES
Saint Peter's College

THEANO PAPAZOGLU MARGARIS, *Οἱ Περιπέτειες τοῦ Θεῖου Πλάτωνα. Διηγήματα* [The Adventures of Uncle Plato]. Athens Astr 1972. Pp. 203.

For about thirty five years Mrs. Theano Papazoglou Margaris has diligently cultivated Modern Greek Literature in America with her consciousness alive to the problems of the Greek immigrant, with her heart open to the pains and joys, vices and virtues, of the simple people. She has strived, with faith and enthusiasm, to enlighten and strengthen tormented people, to instill courage into the souls of disappointed persons, to show them their good elements, and to put them back again on their own feet among the unexpected storms of the troubled and often contradictory American life. In doing this she speaks from her own experience, for she herself tasted the bitterness of a foreign country, lived with the nostalgia of a lost fatherland, strived to be kept alive, to become self-educated and reach self-consciousness, and finally she strived to create intellectual works and keep high quality in her literary production. Her struggle was difficult and painful, full of dangers and disappointments, misunderstandings and unjust criticism. But, having an open mind and having been bruised by life, she has become well acquainted with the contemporary social and intellectual trends, accepted them critically and assimilated them creatively in her life and work.

Mrs. Margaris was born in Vatika near Troy, grew up in Constantinople, and experienced Asia Minor's catastrophe before coming to America as a young girl. Her childhood experience has remained a bitter-sweet reminiscence during her lonely but active life in America, and this has very often returned, intense and vivid, in her short stories.

Her first book, *Eutychia and Other Short Stories* (Chicago, 1939), had little success. After a terrible and unjust roasting by short-sighted critics, the author was disheartened and remained silent for almost twenty years. However, she again appeared in 1958 with the *A Tear for Uncle Jim. Twelve Greek-American Short Stories*, a book published in Athens and hailed by the critics as "the revelation of a true writer". Then followed *The Chronicle of Halsted Street. Greek-American Short Stories* (Athens, 1962), that subsequently was awarded the 1963 State Literary Award for a Short Story. After two other books and extensive work in newspapers, Mrs. Margaris published her last collection of short stories, *The Adventures of Uncle Plato* (Athens, 1972), which is the mature and juicy fruit of an important and continually ascending literary production.

As in her earlier books, and much more in her last one now, Mrs. Margaris presents a series of excellent short stories, which are simple and frank, human and humane, full of emotion and pain, kindness and nostalgia, teeming with gentle feelings and true life, ironical disposition and serene wisdom. They speak to the heart as well as to the mind, putting questions but also charming the soul with their elevating temper; they lash against pettiness, prejudice and superstition, but also commend the great and eternal goods of life. Unfeigned and almost artless, they are characterized by natural power and direct truth, for in these short stories persons and situations are lucidly depicted and convincingly presented. Finally, the short stories display suggestive poetry, stemming spontaneously from the writer's gentle thought

and warm feelings, and from the plain atmosphere in which the narration is usually moving.

All the critics recognize now that "Mrs. Margarīs' prose has utilized worthily, with simplicity and sincere emotion, the Greek immigrant as a theme in Modern Greek literature". But there should be an elucidation here. The Greeks abroad have always been a great financial, intellectual, social, political and, in general, national power for the Greek world. This power was, unfortunately, ignored or misused by the Greek state--although recently the study and investigation of the many aspects concerning the Greeks abroad in the last several centuries have become more productive and revealing. Thus the late ambassador Alexis Kyrou, in a study published shortly before his death, underlining the huge contribution of the Greeks abroad to the life and culture of many foreign countries, cited the names of many Greek clergymen, statesmen, military men, writers, artists, teachers, merchants, industrialists, and many other important Greeks who worked beneficially in those foreign lands.

But there have been also the thousands, the myriads of little anonymous Greek immigrants, who have strived on the one hand to adjust themselves for survival in a new and, most of the times, hostile and difficult environment, and on the other hand to preserve their Greek identity, their Greek quality, their spiritual, cultural, social and national traditions. And those unnamed Greek people have been almost completely ignored by historical research. And yet, **they** are the ones who constitute the real Greece abroad, the new **Magna Graecia**.

Mainly those "small" and unnamed Greeks, simple men and women of America, are presented by Mrs. Margarīs in her short stories with wonderful vividness and clarity, with understanding and affection, powerfully and gracefully. Her work is human, very human, and--why not?--national. Furthermore, it is a source of intellectual and artistic joy that enlightens optimistically our barren lives of today.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
Hellenic College

Barnabas Tzortzatos, Metropolitan of Kitrous: **Οἱ Βασικοὶ Θεσμοὶ Διοικήσεως τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων Πατριαρχείων Μετὰ Ἱστορικῶν Ἀνασκοπήσεων** [The Fundamental Administrative Principles of the Orthodox Patriarchates with a Historical Review]. Athens, 1972. Pp. 433.

In modern times, when all Institutions and old values are living through a great crisis, the Church cannot but participate in this critical experience which characterizes our days. Thus the study of the fundamental administrative institutions, or rather the basic rules and canons which underly the life of the Orthodox Church is more than necessary. Barnabas Tzortzatos, one of the most educated and enlightened clergymen of the Church of Greece

today, gives us a synoptic account of the administrative rules which help all the independent Orthodox Churches to live and flourish amidst the temptations and difficulties of modern life.

The author does not claim that he presents something new. But his compilation is very important because many Orthodox scholars are completely ignorant of the way the Sister Orthodox Churches live and solve their daily problems. Moreover, the work of Metropolitan Barnabas contributes to a better understanding and to a closer communication which are so much required among the Orthodox Churches.

The author presents to his readers the "Constitutions," so to speak, of all the Orthodox Patriarchates and he discusses their historical development and evolution. He does not fail to mention the canons and the rules which must govern the clergy, their election, the problems associated with ecclesiastical property, the structure of parishes, as well as the different Synodical committees. Rules which deal with rural cemeteries are not ignored nor are the penalties imposed upon those who transgress the rules of their respective Churches. In other words, the author covers all aspects of Church life and his work becomes an indispensable reference book for those who wish to study the canonical structure of the Orthodox Churches. Metropolitan Barnabas includes a complete index which makes the use of his book easier and more useful.

But the most important thing, we believe, is the fact that in this book the whole life of the Church is lived, not in the dead letter of the law but in the probing and penetrating power of the Holy Spirit. One has only to read the rules which govern the philanthropic activities of the Church in order to grasp the usefulness of Metropolitan Barnabas' book. His book is a "must" for all theological libraries.

GEORGE S. BEBIS

Holy Cross School of Theology

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Arnakis, George G. and Wayne S. Vucinich. **The Near East in Modern Times. Vol. 2. Forty Crucial Years, 1900-1940.** Austin and New York: The Pemberton Press, 1972. 356 pp.
- Chatzeioannou, Kyriakos. **He archaia Kypros eis tas hellenikas pegas. Vol. 1. Ta thryloumena, historia kai ethnologia apo ton proistorikon chronon mechri tou 395 m. ch.** Nicosia: Archdiocese of Cyprus, 1971. 481 pp. paper.
- Daniel, Robert L. **American Philanthropy in the Near East, 1820-1960.** Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970. 322 pp. \$10.00.
- Ekklesiastikai Ekdoseis Ethnikes Ekatonpentekontaeteridos.**
- No. 1. Kalinderes, Michael A. Charisios D. **Megdanis.** Athens: 1971. 75 pp. paper.
- No. 2. Pherouses, Demetrios. **Morphes tou Genous.** Athens: 1971. 123 pp. paper.
- No. 3. Skouteres, Konstantinos V. **Keimena tou Neou Hellenismou.** Athens: 1971. 187 pp. paper.
- No. 4. Pherouses, Demetrios. **Morphes tou Genous. Series 2.** Athens: 1971. 107 pp. paper.
- No. 5. Paulopoulos, Nikodemos. **Hagios Nikodemos ho Hagioreites.** Athens: 1971. 210 pp. paper.
- No. 6. Paraskevaides, Christodoulos. **Meletios ho Pegas.** Athens: 1971. 204 pp. paper.
- No. 7. Papoulides, Konstantinos. **To kinema ton Kollyvadon.** Athens: 1971. 111 pp. paper.
- No. 8. Perantones, Ioannes. **Lexikon ton Neomartyron. vol. I. A-D.** Athens: 1972. 177 pp. paper.
- No. 9. Perantones, Ioannes. **Lexikon ton Neomartyron. vol. II. E-L.** Athens: 1972. 181-316 pp. paper.
- No. 10. Perantones, Ioannes. **Lexikon ton Neomartyron. vol. III. M-O.** Athens: 1972. 325-500 pp. paper.
- No. 11. Konstas. K. S. **Ho Hagios Kosmas ho Aitolos.** Athens: 1973. 196 pp. paper.

- Galites, George A. *The Problem of Intercommunion from an Orthodox Point of View, A Biblical and Ecclesiological Study*. Athens: 1968. pp.
- Germanos, Metropolitan of Eleias. *Remata zoes: Dialexeis ethiko-koinonikai*. Athens: 1972. 181 pp. paper.
- Hannick, Christian. *Studien zu liturgischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. Vienna: Hermann Böhlau, 1972. 175 pp. paper.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. *Athanase d' Alexandrie. Sur l' incarnation du Verbe*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1973. pp. 484. paper.
- Konstantinides, Photios. *S. Andreas ho Protokletos*. Nicosia: 1971. 30 pp. 14 plates. paper.
- Kourkoulas, Konstantinos. *Leukoma Didaskalon tou Genous*. Athens: O.E.D.V., 1971. 182 pp. paper.
- Krapsites, Vasiles. *Taxidi sten Epeiro*. Athens: 1970. 335 pp. 12 plates. paper.
- Kresten, Otto. *Das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel im ausgehenden 16 Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Hermann Böhlau, 1970. 94 pp. paper.
- Kobilinski-Ellis, Lev and Adelbert Davids. *Heilige aus dem alten Russland*. Munster: Aschendorff, 1972. pp. 68.
- Kypriakai Spoudai. vol. 35. *Aphieroma eis ten 150 eterida tes Ethnikes Paliggenesias*. Nicosia: 1971, 298 pp. paper.
- Malingney, Anne-Marie. *Jean Chrysostome, Sur la vaine gloire et l' éducation des enfants*. Paris. Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972. 302 pp. paper.
- Mantzarides, Georgios. *Palamika*. Thessalonike: Pournaras, 1973. 308 pp. paper.
- Maraval, Pierre. *Grégoire de Nysse. Vie de Sainte Macrine*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971. 316 pp. paper.
- Mathaiakes, Metropolitan Titos. *Aggelos K. Nesiotes*. Athens: 1972. 207 pp.
- Mathews, Thomas F. *The Early Churches of Constantinople, Architecture and Liturgy*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1971. xviii, 194 pp. 99 plates.
- Maximos, Metropolitan of Sardeis. *To Oikoumenikon Patriarcheion en te Orthodoxo Ekklesia*. Thessalonike: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1972. 390 pp.

- Methodios, Metropolitan of Axum. Konstantinoupolis Addis Ampempa. Athens: 1972. 211 pp. paper.
- Moschopoulos, Timotheos and Piero Scazzoso (eds). *Simposio Cristiano*. Milan: Istituto di Studi Teologici Ortodossi S. Gregorio Palamas, 1971. 128 pp. paper.
- Nowak, Edward. *Le chrétien devant la souffrance: Étude sur la pensée de Jean Chrysostome*. *Théologie Historique* No. 9. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972. 240 pp. paper.
- Papadopoulos, Stylianos G. *Pateres, auxeseis tes ekklesias, Hagion Pneuma, Melete Patrologike*. Athens: 1970. 78 pp. paper.
- _____. *Gregorios ho Theologos kai hai proypotheseis pneumatologias autou*. Athens: 1971. 162 pp. paper.
- Papademetriou, George. *Introduction to Saint Gregory Palamas*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1973. 103 pp. \$5.00.
- Papadopoulou-Tsanana, Olympia. *He anthropologia tou Megalou Vasileiou*. Thessalonike: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1970. 159 pp. paper.
- Papageorgiou, Athanasios (ed). *Praktika tou Protou Diethnous Kypologikou Synedriou*. *Leukosia* 14-19 Aprilou 1968. vol. 2. *Mesaionikon Tmema*. Nicosia: 1972, 304 pp. 60 plates. paper.
- Pope Paul VI. *The Teachings of Pope Paul VI, 29/12/1967-18/12/1968*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, n.d. 222 pp. paper.
- _____. *The Teachings of Pope Paul VI, 1969*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, n.d. 211 pp. paper.
- _____. *The Teachings of Pope Paul VI, 1970*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, n.d. 522 pp.
- Sarrouj, Ibrahim. *Le sacerdoce chez St. J. Chrysostome d'après son traité: 'Peri Hierosynes.'* Thesis. Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, Faculté de Théologie Protestante, 1972. 233 pp. paper.
- Sardeles, Kostas. *To synaxari tou Genous*. Athens: Helleniko Vivlio, 1971. 332 pp. paper.
- Savramis, Demosthenes. *Das sogenannte schwache Geschlecht*. Munich: Paul List, 1972. 272 pp. paper.
- _____. *Theologie und Gesseltschaft*. Munich: Paul List, 197. 254 pp. paper.

- Scazzoso, Piero. *La teologia de S. Gregorios Palamas, 1296-1359*. Milano: Instituto di Studi Teologici Ortodossi S. Gregorio Palamas, 1970. 165 pp. paper.
- Schedler, Kenneth. *Natur und Gnade: Das sakramentale Denken in der frühen Theologie Paul Tillichs, 1919-1935*. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1970. 248 pp.
- Simotas, Panagiotēs. *Apo ton kosmon tes Palaias Diathekes*. Thessalonike: Pournaras, 1973. 94 pp.
- Sophianos, Demetrios. *Hagios Nikolaos ho en Vounaine: Anekdotā hagiologika keimena, historikai eideseis peri tes mesa-ionikes Thessalias, I aion*. Athens: 1972. 212 pp. 14 plates. paper.
- Stichel, Rainer. *Studien zum Verhältnis von Text und Bild spät- und nachbyzantinischer Vergänglichkeitsdarstellungen. Die Anfangsminiaturen von Psalterhandschriften des 14. Jahrhunderts, ihre Herkunft, Bedeutung und ihr Weiterleben in der griechischen und russischen Kunst und Literatur*. Vienna: Herman Böhlaus, 1971, 153 pp. 8 plates. paper.
- Struve, Gleb. *Russian Literature under Lenin and Stalin, 1917-1953*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971. xvi, 454 pp. \$9.95.
- Vasileiou, Panos. *To monasteri tes Tatarnas Eurytanias*. Athens: Papyros, 1970. 220 pp. paper.
- Stephens, John Lloyd. *Incidents of Travel in Egypt, Arabia Petraea, and the Holy Land*. Edited with an Introduction by Victor Wolfgang von Hagen. Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1970. liv, 473 pp. \$9.95.
- Theodoretos, Monk of Athos. *He eucharistiake symmetoche en Hagio Horei*. Holy Mountain and Athens: 1972. 228 pp. paper.
- Wedek, Harry E. and Wade Baskin. *Dictionary of Pagan Religions*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1971. 364 pp. \$10.00.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XIX

NUMBER 2

AUTUMN, 1974



Published by the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College
Brookline, Massachusetts

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XIX

NUMBER 2

AUTUMN, 1974



Published by the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College
Brookline, Massachusetts

Ideas and opinions expressed in any Article appearing in this REVIEW are those of the Author of the Article, and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editors.

Copyright 1974, Hellenic College

**Published by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College
50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U.S.A.**

Printed in The United States of America

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Official Publication of the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College

○

THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, Chairman, Board of Trustees
THE RT. REV. BISHOP IAKOVOS of Apameia, President
THE REV. STANLEY S. HARAKAS, Dean

○

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor
THE REV. NOMIKOS MICHAEL VAPORIS
Associate Editor
THE REV. GEORGE J. TSOUMAS

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
GEORGE S. BEBIS
THE VERY REV. MAXIMOS AGHIORGOUSSIS
THE REV. THEODORE G. STYLIANOPOULOS
DIMITRI ZAHAROPOULOS
ALBERT STONE, JR.
THE REV. GEORGE KARAHALIOS

Business Manager
STEPHEN CALLOS

○

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

MILTON V. ANASTOS (University of California, Los Angeles)
GEORGE G. ARNAKIS (University of Texas)
PETER CHARANIS (Rutgers University)
DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS (Stockton State College)
DENO J. GEANAKOPLOS (Yale University)
GEORGE A. PANICHAS (University of Maryland)
JOHN E. REXINE (Colgate University)
PETER TOPPING (University of Cincinnati)



THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is a publication for the exchange of scholarly papers and reviews in the fields of Biblical Studies, Orthodox Theology, Church History, Byzantine History, and related Classical, Archaeological, and Philosophical Studies.

A subscription to the **REVIEW** costs seven dollars per annum. The price of a single number is four dollars.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, requests for advertising and subscriptions, and notices of change of address should be directed to the Editor of **THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW**, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146.

All MSS submitted for consideration by the **REVIEW** should be typewritten double-spaced; and all notes and documentation should be separately paged. Articles are approved for publication, or rejected, by the Editorial Boards. Rejected articles will be returned to the Author only if the latter has supplied a self-addressed stamped envelope.

The **REVIEW** is published twice yearly, Spring and Fall, by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146. It is indexed in **Historical Abstracts**, **Religious and Theological Abstracts**, and **The Index to Religious Periodical Literature**.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

The Divine Light in the Poetry of St. Symeon the New Theologian (949-1025) DEMETRI STATHOPOULOS	95
Patriarch Photios' Letter to the Bishops in Exile DESPINA STRATOUDAKI WHITE	113
Restoration and Liberation in and by the Community EMILIANOS TIMIADIS Metropolitan of Calabria	131
"The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" of Dionysios the Areopagite: A Liturgical Interpretation GEORGE S. BEBIS	159
A Theology of the Sacrament of Holy Confession STANLEY S. HARAKAS	177

BOOK REVIEWS:

Ἡ Περὶ Μνημοσύων Ἔρις ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει κατὰ τὴν ΙΗ' Αἰῶνα [The Quarrel over Memorial Services on the Holy Mountain in the Eighteenth Century] by Charilaos S. Tzogas	
Τὸ Κίνημα τῶν Κολλυβάδων. [The Kollyvades Movement] . by Konstantinos K. Papoulides Reviewed by NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS	203
Γεράσιμος Βλάχος ὁ Κρήσις (1605/7 - 1685). Φιλόσοφος, Θεολόγος, Φιλολόγος. [Gerasimos Vlachos the Cretan (1605/7-1685)] by B. N. Tatakis Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS	208

Jesús überlebt seine Mörder by Demosthenes Savramis Reviewed by LEWIS J PATSAVOS	211
Das sogenannte schwache Geschlecht by Demosthenes Savramis Reviewed by LEWIS J. PATSAVOS	213
Alumni Lectures Number Two and Three, preface by N. M. Vaporis Reviewed by JOHN E. REXINE	214
St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite by Constantine Cavarinos Reviewed by JOHN E. REXINE	216
The Christian Tradition A History of the Development of Doctrine, Volume 2 by Jaroslav Pelikan Reviewed by STANLEY S. HARAKAS	217
Kingdoms and Strongholds of the Crusaders by T. S. R. Boase Reviewed by MILTIADES B. EFTHIMIOU	219
Icons: Theology in Color by Eugene N. Trubetskoi Reviewed by CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS.....	219
BOOKS RECEIVED	223
SUPPLEMENT	
Codex (B') Beta of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS	S-3

BOOK REVIEWS

Charilaos S. Tzogas, **Ἡ Περὶ Μνημοσύων Ἐρις ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει κατὰ τὸν ΙΗ' Αἰῶνα**. [The Quarrel over Memorial Services on the Holy Mountain in the Eighteenth Century]. Supplement No. 3 of the Scholarly Review of the School of Theology of the Aristotelian University of Thessalonike. Thessalonike 1969. 187 Pp. Paper.

Konstantinos K. Papoulides, **Τὸ Κίνημα τῶν Κολλυβάδων**. [The Kollyvades Movement]. Athens 1971. 111 Pp. Paper

In 1754 the monks of the *skete* of St. Anne on Mount Athos arbitrarily decided, contrary to the tradition and practice of all the monasteries of Mt. Athos, to perform memorial services for the dead not on Saturday, the customary day, but on the Lord's day. This simple change in liturgical practice was the beginning of a religious controversy, which was extremely bitter and even cost lives. It was to last throughout the century and into the next, terminating just two years before the outbreak of the Greek Revolution in 1821.

The monks of St. Anne had appealed for funds among the Orthodox faithful to rebuild their church. They were very successful. But this success brought with it certain problems. They discovered that they had insufficient time to commemorate all the names of the dead—said to have reached 12,000—which had accompanied the donations. So in order to preserve time on Saturday to attend the market at Karyes, they moved the memorial services to Sunday. Opposition to this move was immediate and came from some of the most learned and spiritually minded Greek clergy and monks of the eighteenth century—St. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain, St. Makarios, Metropolitan of Korinthos, Christophoros of Arta, Agapios of Kypros, Athanasios of Paros, and Neophytos of Kausokalyvites.

Opposed to these Traditionalists (named **Kollyvades** in a pejorative manner by their opponents, from *kollyva*, the boiled wheat used in the memorial services) were the Innovators, led by the learned monk Theodoretos of Ioannina, Vessarion of Rapsanes, and Gennadios, deposed Metropolitan of Halep.

The Traditionalists argued that the change in the day of observation was an innovation, contrary to the tradition of the Church and, more important, was a denial of the doctrinal significance of the Lord's day, the day of resurrection. The Innovators, with whom it appears the majority of the monks of Mt. Athos sided, rejected this interpretation and countered by accusing the Traditionalists of "innovation and heresy," for what they considered was the denial of the last two articles of the Creed. In addition, the Traditionalists were charged with being under the influence of Jewish practices because of their insistence on Saturday which they connected

with Neophytos Kausokalyvites, who was of Jewish ancestry and one of the leading Traditionalists. In fact it was Neophytos who first rose in opposition to the monks of St. Anne.

In the course of the quarrel over memorial services, other issues were added to the fierce debate which followed. The Traditionalists advocated frequent communion in place of the most infrequent communion practiced by both monks and lay people at that time, they opposed the practice of blessing icons and of anointing them before installing them in church or home; they opposed kneeling on Sunday because it signified penitence and was contrary to the spirit of the day which was one of gladness and joy over the resurrection, they differentiated between the Great and Small Blessing of Water (**Hagiasmos**), and other issues that could be called minor, except that they were not viewed as such by the Traditionalists.

The latter's attachment to the strict observance of the rubrics of the Church and the involvement of such very conservative monks as Kausokalyvites and especially Athanasios Paros, who rejected the siren of revolution and Western Enlightenment as preached by such people as Regas Pheraios and Adamantios Koraes, have caused many modern Greek scholars to view the Traditionalists only as a movement of reactionaries, of obscurantists, and of enemies of reform and enlightenment, who had little or nothing of any value to offer to the Greek people.

Yet this view is one sided and fails to consider the truly positive aspects of the Traditionalists and concentrates only on their negative features. As monks, the Traditionalists should not and cannot rightly be condemned for not promoting education in Western philosophical and political ideas, natural sciences, and mathematics, although some monks and clergymen did. As a spiritual movement, because this is what the Traditionalists were involved in when not debating minor issues, they tried to bring about a genuine **religious** revival among the Orthodox ~~more~~ frequent communion and more active participation in the sacramental life of the Church, an understanding and more frequent use of the Scriptures and of the spiritual and theological written treasures of Orthodoxy in a language more readily understandable by the people.

From the pen of the Traditionalists came such works as the **Philokalia**, which has since its publication in 1784 given new life to Orthodox theology and spirituality and has attracted the attention and genuine interest of many beyond the Orthodox tradition, the **Neon Martyrologion** which was a call to stand fast and firm in the Orthodox faith and tradition before the attractions of Islam and the rewards available to the converted within the Ottoman Empire, and the **Complete Works** of St. Symeon the New Theologian, to cite only three of the many.

The Traditionalists had a direct influence on the spiritual uplifting of entire areas of Greece, especially in the islands of the Aegean. They influenced a sizable segment of modern Greek literature, they kept alive the hesychastic tradition and apophatic theology within the Orthodox Church; they inspired the foundation of important new monastic centers which produced spiritually orientated monks, and they inspired and provided a direct link to a genuine spiritual revival in other Orthodox countries such as Romania and Russia.

From the pen of the Innovators came little if anything of positive value or of any consequence, nothing that added to the spiritual enlightenment or understanding of the Orthodox people. Except as participants in the controversy over the celebration of memorial services no one ever quotes them or even remembers their names.

The monastic Innovators were supported later not so much because of their theological positions or attitudes toward the traditional ecclesiastical order as for their opposition stance against those who were considered to be intellectually outdated and whose attitude was thought to be generally obscurantist. The true intellectual leader of the opposition is Koraes, a true convert to Western Enlightenment, who believed Western learning held the key to the political and intellectual salvation of the Greek people. As a follower of the English historian Gibbon, Koraes rejected the entire Byzantine legacy, something which, of course, the Traditionalists were not willing to surrender.

One would have normally expected the Patriarchate of Constantinople to have supported the Traditionalists. It did not, although it tried to bring about a compromise when in July 1772, for the first time under Patriarch Theodosios II, it ruled that memorial services could be performed on Saturday and Sunday.

Between July 1772 and August 1819 when Patriarch Gregorios V ruled that it was wrong to maintain that memorial services could only be held on Saturday, as it was equally wrong to deliberately hold them on Sunday when other days were available, the Traditionalists were condemned by Patriarch Samouel (ca. 1773), by a council held on Mt. Athos (1774), and by Patriarch Sophronios II (1776). Leaders such as Athanasios Parios, Agapios of Kypros, Christophoros of Arta, and others were excommunicated, but not Nikodemos or Makarios, as both of our authors rightly point out. All of the Traditionalists were, of course, forgiven and readmitted soon afterwards.

Thus it is with great interest that we turn our attention to two recent studies which discuss "The Kollyvades Movement," and "The Quarrel over Memorial Services." (I would have substituted "The Spiritual Revival and the Religious Controversies of the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century" as much more accurate and less partisan.) The two words are of rather unequal quality, probably because of their purpose, and represent a somewhat different evaluation of the movement and controversy. The study by Charilaos S. Tzogas is a doctoral study written at the University of Thessalonike and is the most comprehensive work on the subject that has appeared to date, even though its title is much too restrictive for its contents. The small book by Konstantinos K. Papoulides is number 7 of the series of "Ecclesiastical Editions," published by the Church of Greece on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the independence of Greece, and is a summary account intended for the general reader.

Konstantinos Papoulides is far more sympathetic to the Traditionalists than is Charilaos Tzogas. According to Papoulides, "the principal objective purpose of the Traditionalists is the education of the Greek world. Hence the majority of their works were written in the common language of the time and not in the language of the learned so that the teaching might be understood by the masses of the faithful." (pp. 80-81). He rejects the charge of

innovation hurled against the Traditionalists by their opponents, whom he calls Liberals. Their "innovation," he rightly believes, consisted of a return to the ecclesiastical and patristic tradition and sought the spiritual uplifting of the faithful.

Papoulides attributes to the Traditionalists the existence of monastic life (outside of Mt. Athos) in Greece today. And with some exaggeration he goes on to say that "without the Kollyvades, the 'secularistic' storm of the period (18th century) would have swept away everything" (p. 24). Paradoxically, however, he does not believe that the Traditionalists movement was one of religious "enlightenment" (p. 25), while Tzogas admits it was a "reform" movement but with serious reservations. The difficulty here with both is in the definition of the terms "enlightenment" and "reform," for both writers admit and attribute to the Traditionalists many activities which cannot be viewed otherwise than as a contribution towards religious enlightenment and reform.

Their misgivings could be sustained if the Traditionalists had confined themselves to quarreling over the strict observance of liturgical rubrics and other ecclesiastical practices and had not produced and taught the great mass of spiritual literature, all within the genuine theological tradition of the Orthodox Church.

Tzogas denies that the Traditionalists sought to return to the genuine Christian and patristic spirit, to the purity of life and revered traditions of the early church, as some of their early and later apologists have maintained. On the contrary he accuses them of deliberately awaiting an opportunity to create a controversy which, he maintains, was endemic on Mt. Athos due to the general ignorance of the monks; of being unable to understand "the demands of the new age," of confusing essence with details; of misunderstanding the basic teachings of patristic theology (especially on the part of Kausokalyvites and Parios), and of opposing the reformers (his name for the Innovators) who sought to adopt the Church to new social conditions."

Such generalizations, although very provocative and quite interesting, are repeated throughout the study, yet Tzogas fails to develop them in any way. There is no elaboration as to what were the "demands of the new age" that the Traditionalists were thwarting, and what "the contemporary social conditions" were which the Traditionalists failed to meet by their attempts to spiritually revitalize the Orthodox people. One cannot take serious the assertion that the Traditionalists should not have resisted the ideas emanating from western Europe because the philosophy and teachings of Leibnitz, Wolff, and Locke would have morally uplifted the Greeks.

Dr Tzogas does not explain in any convincing or meaningful way why the "demands of the new age" and the refusal to meet "the contemporary social conditions" by the Traditionalists ruled out maintaining the traditional practice of holding memorial services on Saturday (so that the monks could have more time **for business** on Saturday?), more frequent communion, more spiritualized prayer, more intelligible reading of the Scriptures, and being conscious Orthodox Christians? Or was their major sin the fact that they did not teach the things that led to revolution, or did not preach revolution itself within the same generation as the debacle of the Orlov rising in the Peloponnesos?

Yet even Tzogas must admit that "the spiritual elements which are contained in the Kollyvades movement have their roots in Orthodox tradition and life. Many of the Kollyvades, despite their disputatious battle over details, were participants of genuine Orthodox life and contributed to the dissemination of Orthodox teaching."

I believe Dr. Tzogas could have utilized the fifty pages he devotes to biographical sketches of the protagonists (extremely useful because some are relatively unknown but unnecessary to the main subject) to the discussion of the wider issues which he insists are there, but does not present, and to a more balanced treatment of the positive aspects of the Traditionalists.

What Tzogas and other detractors of the Traditionalists have failed to demonstrate is the existence of any connection between the innovating and practical minded monks who broke the tradition over the celebration of memorial services and thus provoked the controversy, and "the new ideas" from the West. The monastic opposition to the Traditionalists did not arise from any deeper understanding of the theology of Orthodoxy or its liturgical practice but from a need to defend positions which were arrived at because of general decline and of convenience. Instead of arguing that the change was indeed an innovation but an acceptable one, the Innovators countered by characterizing the older traditions as heresy, and their advocates of being Judaizers, Westernizers, and "Masons."

Admittedly, in the course of the controversy, much that was said and done on both sides causes any serious Christian to blush with embarrassment. It was far from being an edifying chapter in the history of the Church. But it should be emphasized that the most important Traditionalists: Nikodemos Hagiorites, Makarios of Korinthos, and Neophytos Kausokalyvites withdrew from the controversy very early and confined themselves in the main to teaching and writing.

Moreover, despite their apparent defeat, the Traditionalists have been vindicated to a large extent by subsequent historical developments. Memorial services are not conducted on Sunday on Mt. Athos, although they are in parish churches as they were in the time of the controversy: Holy Communion is received more often by both laymen and monks everywhere in the Orthodox Church; the study of Scripture and the works of Orthodox spirituality are central in Orthodox theology today; and there is, at the present, thanks to the Traditionalists in large part, a more general and serious awareness of the vast written spiritual resources of the Orthodox Church even among lay people, not to mention the theologians.

While Tzogas' book merits much praise for the thoroughness of his research in both printed and unprinted works, in his detailed examination of all the minutiae of the controversy, in his correction of a number of errors made by authors before him, he fails to draw all the conclusions from his research. He neglects, as Papoulides correctly points out, to consider, for example, the favorable evaluations of the Traditionalists made by such scholars as A. Argyriou, Louis Petit, and J. Guillou. Nonetheless, he has demonstrated, and for this we should all be grateful, the kind of research that must be undertaken if a definitive history of the controversy is to be written.

The subject, however, still requires study and more careful evaluation. Both studies are contributions, but others are still needed.

NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS
Hellenic College

B. N. Tatakis, **Γεράσιμος Βλάχος ὁ Κρήσιος (1605/7 - 1685).**

Φιλόσοφος, Θεολόγος, Φιλολόγος.

[Gerasimos Vlachos the Cretan (1605/7-1685). *Philosopher, Theologian, Philologist*] Library of the Hellenic Institute of Venice of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies. No. 5. Venice, 1973. Pp. xx., 164, and 3 pictures.

Besides its annual bulletin, *Thesaurismata*, the Greek Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies of Venice has published since 1962 a series of books of great scholarly and artistic value. The fifth book in the series is a monography by B. N. Tatakis, Professor Emeritus of Thessaloniki University, about the life and work of Gerasimos Vlachos the Cretan. Vlachos was one of the most important personalities of the seventeenth century. As clergyman, teacher, and writer he worked extensively and productively in Crete, Venice, and Corfu until his death in 1685.

After a short prefatory note by M. I. Manousakas, the director of the Greek Institute of Venice, there follows a preface by the author, and a bibliography. The next section constitutes part one, "Vlachos' Biography and Writings" (pp. 1-54), which is subdivided into three main chapters with many sub-chapters, "Vlachos' Biography", "Vlachos' Library", and "Vlachos' Writings and their Chronology". The main section of the book is its second part, "Presentation and Analysis of Vlachos' Works" (pp. 55-149), in five chapters and many subdivisions. In this section Professor Tatakis presents and analyzes five of Vlachos' works: *Thesaurus of Encyclopedic Basis in Four Languages, On Grammatical Method, On Rhetorical Power, Paraphrases of and Questions on the Entire Logic Treatise of Aristotle, and Definitive Harmony of Beings*. Finally, an epilogue, an index of proper names, a summary in Italian and three pictures complete this excellent book.

Gerasimos Vlachos was, as already mentioned, a leading intellectual figure during the seventeenth century, and his activity and influence were long and fruitful. Prof. Tatakis' painstaking investigation of all available sources has first of all ascertained and verified the well known facts of Vlachos' life and work; and secondly and most important, it has added many new and unknown elements that allow us to see Vlachos and his times under a clearer light. Thus now we are better able to value and appreciate Vlachos' contribution to the intellectual awakening of the enslaved Greek nation—his attempt, at least, to keep kindled the torch of philosophical, philological and theological inquiry and study during those difficult and what were considered "sterile" years for Hellenism during the Turcocracy. They were difficult, indeed, those years, but they were not entirely sterile, as we

discover from recent historical and philological research. Even earlier, but mainly during the seventeenth century (and of course later), there were countless Greeks in Greece, but especially abroad, who were writing, teaching and trying in general to educate and enlighten the enslaved Greek nation.

Particularly they worked to strengthen the native conscience and self-knowledge of the Greek people, and tried to make them acquire even more tangibly the feeling of their own historical continuity. Last but not least, in the field of education they not only gave to the Greek people the basic elements of knowledge, but also they introduced them to the contemporary intellectual and scientific currents. This enlightenment became all the more systematic and productive gradually, thus preparing the intellectual and political liberation of the Greeks. However, many Greek writers of that period are either unknown or at best misunderstood and most of their works remain unpublished.

Prof. Tatakis' book is very interesting both for its theme and for the way he presents it. The book recreates the atmosphere of the times in which Gerasimos Vlachos lived so intensely and worked so fruitfully and, as already mentioned, it also presents unknown phases of his life and work. Specifically, for the first time we learn directly about five hard-to-find or still unpublished works of Vlachos; and we become thoroughly acquainted with them through Prof. Tatakis' analytical, integrated presentation, with clarity and orderly sequence of the basic components and essential details. The elaborate treatment by Prof. Tatakis of those five writings of Vlachos is indeed a philological work of superior quality which undoubtedly will facilitate a critical, scholarly edition of those works.

But Professor Tatakis is mainly a philosopher, one of the principal Modern Greek philosophers. Therefore it was very natural for him to examine and emphasize Vlachos' philosophical work. He particularly stressed the Aristotelian character of Vlachos' philosophy, the earlier and contemporary philosophical influences he received, and his personal philosophical contribution. Prof. Tatakis points out also to the presence of serious philosophical thinkers during Turcocracy as a significant fact showing clearly, as he rightly states, that "the Greek mind never ceased cultivating philosophy. . . . Thus we have the singular opportunity to be able to follow its rich, multiform, and always interesting philosophical march, uninterrupted since Homer's time until today."

Of course the surest way for one to enjoy a good book is to read it carefully from cover to cover. And this is what Prof. Tatakis' book on Gerasimos Vlachos asks. However, I cite below some characteristic quotations which may, in some way, show its structure and substance, the breadth and depth of its aims, particularly in regard to Vlachos' opinions concerning language and education. Tatakis writes

Everyone recognizes that Gerasimos Vlachos was the first of the Greeks to edit and publish a dictionary, and therefore that he was the first modern Greek lexicographer. . . . I think, however, that Vlachos' contribution has great significance for the history of modern Greek education from another point of view. . . . The basis of Vlachos' dictionary is the common modern Greek, the spoken language. . . . This is a valiant leap forward in the Greek lexicographic tradition.

Vlachos zealously pursued his nation's enlightenment; most of his works aspired to be educational manuals. He understood how important and necessary a weapon for education is the dictionary, and thus he did not design it only for the scholars. He gave it a broader basis; he wanted it as a weapon that would help whoever thirsts for education. For that reason he started from the language that every Greek knows, feels and lives; and it is with this language that he opened the lingual horizons of ancient Greek and two other languages, Latin and Italian. . . . He started from the spoken Greek language as the lingual reality of his time, with its abundant learned elements known almost to everyone and with its also abundant dialectal, especially Cretan, elements. (p. 60).

And elsewhere:

As we see, according to Vlachos, the body of grammar is oral speech. This is the thought of a forerunner. Significant also is his definition of "word": its essence is that it is the minimally divisible part of the syntax. (p. 63).

And in his epilogue Prof. Tatakis writes

His struggle had many fronts. Vlachos was one of those who profoundly felt the dangers and who were dedicated to the struggle. The depth that governed and characterized Vlachos' writings and actions was a common one: The faith that knowledge is a great good and a primary one, for it enlightens the mind and cleanses the heart. This faith spurred him on in his task of enlightening himself and others. Thus . . . we have in Vlachos a bearer of fervent faith and, simultaneously, an inquisitive mind, capable of setting things in order, a mind ready to accept the new. For, his thought brings him to the new, without shaking his well-founded faith. Therefore he was, I think, a more integrated man and a continuator of Byzantine humanism. (p. 150).

Particularly I would like to emphasize what Professor Tatakis writes in the last paragraph of his book:

I hope that our young philologists, and especially those who occupy themselves with the investigation of modern Greek education and thought, will see what rich themes of inquiry Vlachos is offering with his life and with his many, still unpublished, works (p. 152).

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
Hellenic College

Demosthenes Savramis, *Jesus überlebt seine Morder*, Munich: List Verlag, 1973, 248 Pp. Paper.

This is not the first time that I am reviewing a book of Dr. Savramis. Like other works by this author, the present book is characterized by the same forcefulness and clarity of thought. The author's purpose is put forth in the opening pages of his book (p. 22). History records the crucifixion of our Lord as having taken place in 33 A.D., and the Jews are traditionally held responsible for it. Nevertheless, any society censured for its disregard of virtues like tolerance, love, freedom or justice is potentially capable of destroying its critics. The fate of Socrates at the hands of Greek society in 399 B.C. is one example. The same can be said of any society at any time in history.

With regard to our Lord, He is constantly being crucified by the evil forces evident in every society throughout history. These forces are as much at work in our own society as they were in the corrupt society which delivered Jesus to the cross 20 centuries ago. And yet in spite of this, as amply stressed by the author, our Lord lives on in the millions of people who are sustained by their belief in Him.

There is no doubt that this revolutionary book raises questions that every conscientious Christian ought to be asking himself. Equally culpable with the physical perpetrators of our Lord's crucifixion are the moral perpetrators of any act which dehumanizes mankind. The author reminds us that this is the meaning conveyed by the parable of Judgement Day in Mt. 25: 40, "Anything you did for one of my brothers here, however humble, you did for me" (p. 22-23).

For 2000 years our Lord is continually being crucified and put to death. Shocking as it may be, His murderers are usually to be found in those societies which call themselves Christian. In reality, however, these societies destroy life by the ethic to which they ascribe, while at the same time being sanctioned by the established Church. And yet our Lord lives on in all those who by their faith in Him strive to perpetuate the humanization of mankind as Christ willed and to invigorate both society and the established Church. Our Lord lives on as well in those who fight for the dignity of man, even though they may not profess Christ. As stated already in Mt. 25. 40, our Lord identifies Himself with all those who are suffering and in need. We are thereby reminded that the good done to our fellow man is like an offering to God. On the contrary, the evil done, whether it be social, mental or physical, is like putting Christ to death.

Whoever is involved in helping his fellow man improve his life offers help to Christ Himself. Through this help the humanization of mankind desired by our Lord becomes a reality and man is freed from his social, mental and spiritual misery. This again means that our Lord is alive here and now. The same can be said of every type of society and every Church which considers itself Christian. Whether or not a society, an ethic or a Church takes our Lord's teaching seriously or not depends upon how seriously it takes the suffering of mankind. Any society, ethic or Church which tolerates the exploitation and degradation of man by his fellow man has already placed

itself on the side of the enemies, persecutors and murderers of Christ.

Examples from the distant as well as from the recent past are not lacking to impress upon the reader that established Christian society has often failed to live up to the expectations of Christ's teachings. Cited are. the sacking of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade, the official Church's attitude towards World War I in Germany, subsequent attitudes favoring war as expressed by individual ecclesiastical dignitaries, the highly questionable relationship between the Vatican and Mussolini; the passive stand of the Eastern Church to communism in communist countries; the official Church's moral involvement in repressive political systems such as colonialism and fascism, etc.

So as not to create the fallacious impression that the official Church is bereft of great personalities unwilling to compromise principles in return for security from their adversaries, the author recounts the example of St. Francis of Assisi in the West and Sts. Gregory Nazianzen and John Chrysostom in the East.

The book closes with the author's own evaluation of the theses developed throughout his work (pp. 215-17). He is convinced that our Lord's murderers **cannot** outlive Him and **will not** outlive Him. Either must our Lord's teachings concerning peace, love and justice prevail, or mankind and the world in which we exist will be destroyed. Even if peace should prevail in the form of the absence of war, man will be no better off than today, particularly if hatred, greed and tyranny replace love in the affairs of men. As long as our Lord's desired reconciliation of man with God, with himself, with his fellow men, with the world about him and with nature remains unattainable, man will remain a slave of his material achievements. Because of their onesidedness, these achievements can only impede the harmony between man and nature and between man and the world about him. Furthermore, they only bring with them the loss of man's identity as well as his total alienation. Under the pressure of this alienation, young people will find the world in which they must live more and more unbearable. The result of this will be the ever increasing number of neurotics, psychopaths and suicides.

Mankind can ultimately destroy itself by overlooking and ignoring the dangers which power resulting from injustice conceals. As long as injustice and oppression take the place of justice and freedom, man can never be liberated from the "devil's sphere of power", the results of which are felt every day.

In view of the many political, social, economic, etc. problems inherited by younger generations, the legitimate question is raised as to whether there is enough hope to justify optimism. Dr. Savramis answers with both yes and no. No, if man continues to depend upon his supposedly limitless possibilities, which entertain the illusion that man can solve all his problems through technology. No, if man believes he can secure his well-being at the expense of others. Yes, however, if man is conscious of his frailty and recognizes his dependence upon forces, which neither technology nor any other material progress of man can replace. Yes, if all conscientious Christians are convinced that Christ lives and can transform mankind. Yes, if these same Christians constantly refuse to assent to existing situations as if they were a

permanent state of affairs, whether in the political, social, economic, or religious spheres. And finally yes, if they unceasingly toil for the renewal of the world in the spirit of Jesus Christ

There is no doubt that the provocative theses of the author will offend those who do not question the source of authority. However, for the sincere and concerned Christian, the issues dealt with in this revolutionary book will undoubtedly cause him to reevaluate his hitherto complacent stand on many or all of them.

LEWIS J. PATSAVOS

Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology

Demosthenes Savramis, **Das sogenannte schwache Geschlecht**. Munich: Paul List Verlag, 1972. Pp. 267. Paper.

In an age of the Women's Liberation Movement this book is a timely presentation. The author's main objective is to demonstrate that the term "weak sex" for women is a male invention, which blames the opposite sex for the male's inadequacy. The author makes his point and then reinforces it with ten supporting theses. These are followed by texts of some of the world's great thinkers concerning their views on women. Included are John Chrysostom, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, Arthur Schopenhauer, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Friedrich Nietzsche and Friedrich Engels. The result is a demythologizing of the world of the male and evidence that the male's campaign to degrade the female actually brings about the degradation of the male. In reality, there is neither a weak male nor a weak female.

Ultimately, the author attempts to reveal that the degradation brought upon the male in his campaign to degrade the female in fact implies the degradation of man generally. This calamitous situation, caused by the mutual degrading of the sexes, can only be resolved through concentrated efforts by both male and female. The author further affirms that success or failure of such an endeavor depends upon whether or not man finally realizes that God has entrusted His creation not only to Adam, but to Adam and Eve.

Certainly no woman will remain unmoved by the responsible manner in which this book speaks out in defence of the female—not because it is fashionable nowadays to do so—but because it is God's will that man and woman be equal.

LEWIS J. PATSAVOS

Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology

Alumni Lectures Number Two. Preface by N. M. Vapori. Brookline, Massachusetts Holy Cross School of Theology, 1972. Pp 74 Paper

Alumni Lectures Number Three. Preface by N. M. Vapori. Brookline, Massachusetts. Holy Cross School of Theology, 1973. Pp 113. Paper

The Holy Cross Alumni Association has happily been able to continue publishing, in modest but acceptable form, its **Alumni Lectures** on theological and historical topics as a service to the school and the community at large. The first number appeared in 1971* and included two lectures. The second number, **Alumni Lectures Number Two**, also contains two lectures by prominent Orthodox scholars. The first by the Reverend Professor Demetrios J. Constantelos is entitled "The Last Phase of the Conflict between Greek Thought and Christian Orthodoxy in the Middle Ages" (5-21) and concerns itself with the problem of the relations between Greek thought and the Greek Orthodox religion, especially as manifested by the controversy between Pletho and Gennadios, with Pletho's emphasis on Greek thought and his attempt to place it above Christianity, while pursuing a course of action that shows him as a patriot and ideologue in pursuit of a utopia, whereas Gennadios, in his evangelical zeal, is seen as fanatic and intolerant and, in the controversy between Gennadios and Pletho's disciple, Iuvenalios, there is shown the conflict between liberal and undefined Christian Hellenism and Evangelical or Fundamentalist Christianity. Both Gennadios and Pletho are shown to have violated the patristic principle of **diakrisis** and **metron** in everything. David Evans' considerably longer and more complex contribution entitled "Towards a Western Orthodoxy A Modest Proposal for the Reorganization of the Orthodox Theological Curriculum in the Face of the Challenge of the Christian West" (22-73) begins with the question of what ought to be the curriculum of a theological seminary or department of religion and becomes a comprehensive review of the relations between Orthodox theology and tradition and Western, particularly Scholastic theology. Dr. Evans reviews what Orthodox tradition has been and how it has been misused, modified, or violated by the Orthodox themselves and proposes a return to the Orthodox Tradition as it should be that would involve the Church's establishing its own identity and advancing to encounter its future and revising its theological curriculum accordingly. Basic to his entire approach is the notion of Tradition as the bearer of **gnosis**, evaluated in the light of Western **ratio**

Alumni Lectures Number Three takes quite a decidedly positive turn in that the quality of reproduction is first-rate and the number of papers published rises to eight. It could also be said that the papers are, on the whole, less scholarly and of much greater general interest. The volume itself is dedicated to His All-Holiness, Demetrios I, The Ecumenical Patriarch, and has a wider, "ecumenical" perspective. The first lecture by the Reverend George Karahalios deals with the "Mysticism of the Eleventh Century—Michael Psellos" (7-20) and systematically outlines the mystical teaching of this leading 11th century personality in terms of his views of God, Creation, and Man and clearly shows that man finds himself between two extremes: **hyle** (matter) and spirit. Among other notable observations, Father Karahalios notes of Psellos that "Put in a mystical tone, man as a psychosomatic

hierarchically multi-powered entity, cannot immediately and directly hope to achieve 'deification' unless he evolves gradually from the lower to the higher faculties—a process most tedious and difficult on earth" (p. 15). In a delightfully personal but revealing account of "Apostle Andreas in Cyprus: Legend, Tradition and Faith" (21-39) Professor Costas M. Proussis relates much from the living Cypriot oral tradition about St. Andreas and the Monastery of Saint Andreas on the promontory of the same name at the northeast tip of Cyprus, while Father Philotheos Faros, in "The Transfer of the Parish Priest and the Dynamics of Separation" (41-68), applies the knowledge gained from psychotherapy, psychoanalysis, psychology, Scriptures, and Patristics to a practical parish problem in order to provide guidance to church administrative authorities for a better understanding of the dynamics and consequences of such action. Father Pharos impressively points out that "The study of psychodynamics of the separation and of group dynamics verifies the early Church's realization and points out the serious consequences that the loss of a significant person or group leader have on the development of the loss-sufferers or on the life of the group" (p. 64). In his contribution "Spiritual Renewal: The Orthodox Laity" (69-87), Father Anthony Coniaris, in what amounts to an inspirational homily, argues against a "spectator Christianity" and for the proper active participation of the laity in the Orthodox Church, and in so doing reviews the roles of the priest and the laity. University of Thessaloniki Theology Professor Ioannes E. Anastasiou in his piece on "The Neomartyrs of the Greek Orthodox Church" (89-100) reviews in general the trials and tribulations of Orthodox martyrs from the earliest, Petros of Trebizond (died 1453), to the last, Georgios of Crete (died 1867) under the Ottoman Turks, and Yale Professor Deno J. Geanakoplos completes the volume with his masterfully written "Saint Nicholas of Myra—A Saint for All Seasons" (101-112), which was delivered on the occasion of the Feast of Orthodoxy at the Greek Orthodox Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in New York City in 1972 at a time when Archbishop Iakovos formally presented certain relics of St. Nicholas secured from the Pope and the Roman Catholic Order of Black Friars to the Greek Community of New York. Those interested in the *real* Santa Claus will find Dr. Geanakoplos's contribution both revealing and pleasing.

There can be no doubt that these annual offerings of the Holy Cross Alumni Association deserve to be circulated more widely and that they contain material that will be of interest to Byzantinists, theologians, historians, and the interested general reader.

JOHN E. REXINE
Colgate University

*A review of this number can be found by this writer in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* XVII. 2 (Fall 1972), 296-297.

Constantine Cavaros, **St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite**. *Modern Orthodox Saints* 3. Belmont, Massachusetts: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1974. Pp. ix, 166. Frontispiece. Hardcover, \$6.00 Paper, \$3.95.

In 1955 the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople officially recognized the sainthood of St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite (1749-1809) for his great contributions to the Church in theology, in his exemplary Christian mode of life, his virtues, and his holiness, even though he had been so regarded unofficially long before this: "During his entire holy life he had only one care and concern, to serve the Divine Will and to benefit his neighbor" (p. 92). His entire life was spent in spiritual *askesis* and he is regarded by many as "one of the greatest theologians of the post-Byzantine period, and the greatest of all those who led a monastic life on the Holy Mountain from the beginning to this day" (p. 58). There can be no doubt that Nicodemos was an extraordinary religious writer, contributing significantly to ascetical-mystical theology, ethics, canon law, exegesis, hagiology, liturgics, and hymnography in which, according to Dr. Cavaros, his writings "show not only depth, historical and exegetical accuracy, fidelity to the Orthodox Tradition, extraordinary erudition, real literary gifts and a very strong desire to edify, but also remarkable many-sidedness" (p. 57). But Nicodemos was by no means a sedentary theological scholar but a very powerful spiritual guide and personal counselor whose influence has been widely felt throughout the Orthodox world.

It is no wonder then that Professor Constantine Cavaros has been inspired to continue his impressive series on **Modern Orthodox Saints** (inaugurated in 1971*) by dedicating this volume to the important figure of Nicodemos. The format of the previous volumes is followed in that Dr. Cavaros himself provides a never previously published lengthy introductory chapter (11-63) on the life, works, concerns, and evaluative assessment of Saint Nicodemos and a list of "Works of the Saint" (96-114), available for the first time in English and the most complete and up-to-date bibliography of the saint, as well as a translation of the "Life of Saint Nicodemos" (64-95) by the monk Gerasimos Micragiannanitis of the Holy Mountain of Athos, the original of which was first published on Athos in 1955 and appeared as part of the *Akolouthia* in honor of the saint. Dr. Cavaros has made this particular *vita* available because it is more comprehensive and more elegant than others that could have been translated. The "Selected Passages from the Works of St. Nicodemos" (115-145) give the reader a valuable selection of passages that are particularly characteristic of his teaching and that are especially related and relevant to concerns of contemporary persons interested in Orthodox spirituality. Among the subjects noted are man's dual nature, the soul, destiny of the soul after death, the Resurrection, spiritual food, Divine Scripture, Church Fathers, the Holy Canons, reading, chanting, sin, conscience, Paradise, the way to *theosis*, and the Jesus Prayer.

Perhaps the best summary of St. Nicodemos's life and activity is his own statement that "The greatest and most perfect achievement that man can

think of is to approach God and be united with Him" (p. 131). Dr. Cavarnos continues to deserve high praise for making available to the English-reading public highly valuable compact volumes on modern Orthodox saints that inspiringly reveal their Christian spirituality to the contemporary world.

JOHN E. REXINE
Colgate University

*See this writer's review of *St. Cosmas Aitolos* (Modern Orthodox Saints I) in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 16.1 (1972) 45-46.

Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. Volume 2, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. xxv, 329. \$16.50.

Jaroslav Pelikan, Yale's Sterling Professor of History and Religious Studies, affirms in this second volume of his projected five volume history of the development of Christian doctrine what many western scholars (and not a few eastern writers) deny to Eastern Christendom: doctrinal development.

It is the author's expressed purpose to deal with an eleven century history of doctrinal development to the general exclusion of other dimensions. In the main, he is successful in fulfilling his goal, including only a bare minimum of historical, social and political material so as to provide the necessary background for his topic. The book is addressed to readers with a special interest in Christian history and theology, as well as to historians of Byzantine, Syriac and Slavic civilizations for background purposes. It will also serve as a serious introduction to the teaching of the Eastern Church for the general reader.

One of the major strengths of this volume is its readability. Though very well researched and documented, indicating an admirable command of the sources, it does not suffer from the usual "dryness" of scholarly publications. The style of writing is generally clear, direct and straight-forward. It is a pleasure to read this book.

However, the major judgment to be made upon a work such as this, is whether, as a whole, the author has described well and accurately the subject matter under investigation. There are two ways of responding to this question. The general tenor of the treatment, is the first. The Orthodox Christian student will find no major surprises in this volume. He will find familiar authors treated with fairness and empathy. In fact, it is quite sym-

pathetic to present Eastern Orthodox positions. The book could have been written by an Orthodox Christian, with little or no substantial change. It reflects in large part Orthodox Theology's own self-understanding. A notable strength of the volume, in addition to its familiarity with the sources, is the use of Eastern Orthodox secondary sources.

The second possible response to the adequacy of the treatment, is the issue of development itself. The East has always been caught in the paradox which rejected the commonly expressed western criticism that it is static and fossilized, while continuing to affirm its faithfulness to the ancient doctrines. Pelikan's book is an excellent documentation of the Orthodox self-understanding. The common threads of doctrine are seen running through the eleven centuries—a true orthodoxy of faith. Yet, the vital adaption and restatement to new challenges is not absent, either. The author documents both essential continuity and, within the framework of that continuity, development.

The six chapters deal in succession with the topics of patristic authority, the theology of the icon, the Eastern response to Roman Catholic challenges, the Eastern Christian encounter with Judaism, dualism, Islam and philosophy, as well as the "last flowering of Byzantine Orthodoxy". All of the chapters are well done, but the chapter dealing with Eastern Christian approaches to non-Christian religions will probably be considered the most valuable by readers in that it contains material which is not readily available in other secondary sources.

In several places the author defends his position that doctrinal reasons must be given an important place in the interpretation of historical—and especially ecclesiastical events. He rejects the reductionism characteristic of much modern historical scholarship which interprets church history in primarily political terms. In this too, he will find a sympathetic reading by most eastern Orthodox Theologians (see pp. 170, 177, 198 and 271-2).

His use of Greek in the text is restrained and generally accurate (some errors appear in the latter part of the book—pp. 255, 269, 277). English speaking Orthodox writers will find some of his translations refreshing and illuminating.

We are indeed grateful to Professor Pelikan for this fair, accurate, sympathetic and illuminating study. Non-Orthodox scholars and students will find in this volume a useful and helpful description of the development of Orthodox Christian doctrine in the Churches of the East. It is recommended to students and scholars alike as a valuable contribution not only as a scholarly treatment of the development of doctrine, but also for purposes of ecumenical understanding.

STANLEY S. HARAKAS

Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology

T. S. R. Boase: **Kingdoms and Strongholds of the Crusaders**. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1971. 272 Pp. 1 map, family trees, bibliographic essay.

T. S. R. Boase's book is essentially a narrative of crusading events rather than an analytical study and a discussion of problems. This will make it a handy work of reference for scholars. But the fact that the author apparently tried to accumulate so much material within a relatively limited space has turned numerous portions of it into heavy reading. On the other hand, he is decidedly at his best in his use of illustrations, almost 200 in a 272 page book with a high percentage of this number devoted to castles, churches and personages.

Perhaps the most serious criticism of this book is that the author has not had sufficient access to original Arabic, Latin and Greek texts extant, both manuscript and in print, and thus contented himself with sections versions in European literature. This criticism has always been reiterated against most of the books of the crusades. The **History of the Crusades**, a corporate work by various scholars, designed by J. L. Lamonte and now in charge of K. M. Setton, has made some serious attempt to remedy this shortcoming by means of introducing to the reader the sequence of ideas and systems together with the uniformity of style and method are amongst its most praiseworthy qualities. It might be mentioned, however, that the learned world is now ruled by a galaxy of too many specialists whose unremitting standards of pure research have often deterred the interested reader's mind from aspiring to rise into the stratosphere of time and review the historical configuration of a given movement in its bolder outlines. It is refreshing to find a historian of Boase's courage and caliber to be "concerned with the lives and the settlers, the motives that inspired them, and their own complex personal relationships," irrespective of the hazards and consequences of his attempt.

MILTIADES B. EFTHIMIOU
White Water, California

Eugene N. Trubetskoi. **Icons: Theology in Color**. New York: St. Vladimir's Press, 1973. 100 pp. + 16 color prints. Paper. \$4.00.

This book consists of three essays on the Russian icon by the outstanding Russian philosopher and gifted writer Prince Evgenii Nikolaivich Trubetskoi (1863-1920) that were written before the Russian Revolution of 1918 and published as individual articles during the First World War. They have been translated from the Russian by Gertrude Vakar and are introduced by Professor George M. A. Hanfmann (Harvard University), who also contributed an informative Appendix. The titles of these essays are: "A World View in

Painting," "Two Worlds in Old-Russian Icon Painting," and "Russia and Her Icons."

Trubetskoi speaks in these essays as a man of deep religious faith, as one committed to the Orthodox Christian religion, as an admirer of old-Russian icons, and as a thinker who seeks to explain the nature and meaning of authentic holy icons from a theological and philosophical standpoint.

He rejects naturalistic or, as he calls them, "realistic" icons. Realistic painting on the Western model, he says, invaded Russian churches in the seventeenth century, along with other reforms (p. 20). In such icons, Christ and the saints are depicted with "puffy faces," "red mouths," "thick arms," "fat thighs," and the like (pp. 20-22). He remarks that "**icons must not be painted from living people**," because "an icon is not a portrait, but a prototype of the future man-within-the-church" (p. 21). The aspect of the figures depicted must be unworldly, ascetic, their features refined, spiritualized.

Now old-Russian icons may appear to a superficial observer "dry and lifeless," but "spiritual life shines through with incomparable power" (p. 22). Again, the figures of saints give the impression of immobility. This immobility, however, "is an attribute of those images where not only the flesh but all human nature is silenced, where it no longer lives its own life but a **superhuman** life;" it is "the immobility of divine repose in which the saints are immersed" (pp. 24, 25).

He who is "beguiled by the delights of the flesh" will feel repelled by the ascetic, stern images, because "to heed their call, one has to renounce a large part of his life, the part that is dominant in the world" (27). "They demand that we leave behind all trivial concerns, because 'earthly concerns,' which the church enjoins us to 'lay aside,' also serve the dominance of sated flesh" (28).

Too often, remarks Trubetskoi, "the icon remains an object of superficial esthetic enjoyment that does not penetrate to its spiritual meaning" (42). Yet its beauty is primarily spiritual. The icon is symbolic in nature, it has an otherworldly meaning. It expresses the beauty of God's design, the beauty which Dostoevsky had in mind, when he said "Beauty will save the world" (37). "Our icon painters," adds Trubetskoi, "had seen the beauty that would save the world and immortalized it in colors" (37).

In his essay "Russia and Her Icons," the author notes the important part that was played by Greek icon painters, from the eleventh to the early part of the fifteenth century, in the iconographic decoration of Russian churches and in the development of Russian iconography. He mentions as examples Isaiah the Greek and Theophanes the Greek. The latter, he explains, "was the foremost Novgorod master and teacher of icon painting Andrei Rublev [c. 1370-1430], the founder of independent Russian painting, was his pupil" (74).

However, Trubetskoi sees a major change in Russian iconography during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: it becomes Russianized. Everything in Russian icons becomes Russian: "the faces, the church architecture, even the minor details of daily life" (75). Russian traits often appear even "in the faces of the prophets, apostles, and even the Greek saints Basil the Great and John Chrysostom. Novgorod artists even dare to paint a Russian Christ" (75). According to Trubetskoi, Russian "icon painting reaches its highest perfection

in the fifteenth century, shaking off foreign [i.e. Byzantine] tutelage and becoming truly original and Russian" (79).

It is the claim of Trubetskoi that in becoming Russianized the icon in Russia also became superior to the Byzantine. Thus, he sees in Russian icons of this period a "warmth of feeling" that is foreign to those done by the Greeks of Byzantium (24). Also, he remarks that "Russian icon painting, in contrast to the Greek, did not kill the life of the human face, but gave it higher spirituality and meaning" (24; cf. 58). Those who have a wide acquaintance with Byzantine as well as with Russian iconography—such as was not possible in Trubetskoi's time—would grant the merits of Russian icons of the distinctively Russian period spoken of by Trubetskoi, but would not accept the thesis that these icons are superior to the Russian icons of the earlier period or to Byzantine icons outside Russia, judged from the standpoint of "warmth" and spiritual expression. They would add that in characterizing Greek or Byzantine icons as cold and lifeless, Trubetskoi is but echoing a misinterpretation then widespread in Western Europe, with whose philosophy he was familiar (see e.g. pp. 7, 27). Thus, Hegel characterized Byzantine paintings as "lifeless," while Vischer stigmatized the figures depicted in Byzantine icons as "mummies." (See my book *Byzantine Thought and Art*, pp. 59-60.) Further, it should be recalled that Trubetskoi himself notes that the old-Russian icons of the distinctively Russian period of iconography, which he especially esteemed, also appeared to "superficial observers" and to those "beguiled by the delights of the flesh." as immobile, lifeless, and even repellent.

The author makes interesting remarks about Russian church-architecture, particularly its use of the bulbous dome. Also, he makes many penetrating observations about the close relationship, on the one hand between the religious fervor and lofty world-view of an age and the flourishing of a highly spiritual art, in particular architecture and icon painting, and on the other hand between the spiritual decline and the prevalence of the world-view of "biologism" in an age and the decline of its art.

This book, which is written in a clear and lively style, is important for all those who are interested in iconography, especially in Russian icons. It sets forth some key ideas for the proper understanding of the nature and meaning of authentic, traditional Orthodox icons, ideas that have been developed recently by two eminent Russian writers, Leonide Ouspensky and Vladimir Lossky. These ideas, it may be added, have been arrived at independently and been amply expounded by their Greek contemporaries Photios Kontoglou, famous icon painter, and Panayotis A. Michelis, eminent aesthetician.

CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS
Belmont, Massachusetts

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Antonios Alevizopoulos, **Ξένος ἡμῖν**. Athens: Apostolike Diakonia, 1974. 160 pp. Paper.
- Ioannes Anastasiou. **Κατάλογος Χειρογράφων Κωδίκων 'Ι. Μητροπόλεως Σάμου**. Thessalonike: 1973. 98 pp. 6 plates. Paper.
- Pierre Benoit. **Jesus and the Gospel. Volume II.** Trans. Benet Weatherhead. A Crossroad Book. New York: Seabury Press, 1974. 185 pp. \$8.75.
- Konstantinos G. Bones. **Σκέψεις ἐπὶ Συγχρόνων Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Θεμάτων**. Athens: 1972. 677 pp. Paper.
- Konstantinos G. Bones. **Κλήμεντος Ρώμης 'Επιστολὴ Α' Πρὸς Κορινθίους**. Athens: 1973. 247 pp. Paper.
- Nicholas Cabasilas. **The Life in Christ.** Trans. Carmiro J. de Catanzaro. Intro. Boris Bobrinskoy. New York: St. Vladimir's Press, 1974. 229 pp. Paper. \$5.00.
- E. M. Cioran. **The New Gods.** Trans. Richard Howard. New York: The New York Times Books, 1974. 120 pp. \$5.95.
- O. C. Edwards Jr. **How It All Began: Origins of the Christian Church.** A Crossroad Book. New York: Seabury Press, 1973. 156 pp. \$5.95.
- Stanley S. Harakas. **Living the Liturgy.** Minneapolis: Light & Life Publ. Co., 1974. 144 pp. Paper.
- James Hitchcock. **The Recovery of the Sacred.** A Crossroad Book. New York: Seabury Press, 1974, 175 pp. \$6.95.
- Wolfram Hörandner. **Theodoros Prodromos. Historische Gedichte.** Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1974. 608 pp. Paper.
- Charles Kannengiesser. **Athanasie d'Alexandrie. Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe.** Sources Chrétiennes, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1973. 484 pp. Paper. 98 F.

- John Karmires. *A Synopsis of the Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church*. Trans. George Dimopoulos. Scranton: Christian Orthodox Editions, 1973. 120 pp.
- Alexandros S. Korakides. *Ἡ Περὶ τοῦ Λόγου Θεολογία τῶν Κοντακίων Ρωμανοῦ τοῦ Μαλωδοῦ*. Athens: Ekdoseis Ionia, 1973. 189 pp. Paper.
- V. Lossky. In *the Image and Likeness of God*. Ed. John H. Erickson and Thomas E. Bird. Intro. John Meyendorff. New York: St. Vladimir's Press, 1974. 232 pp. \$5.50. Paper.
- Anne-Marie Malingrey. *Jean Chrysostome, Sur la vaine gloire et l'education des enfants*. Sources Chrétiennes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972. 300 pp. Paper. 55 F.
- Pierre Maraval. *Gregoire de Nysse. View de Sainte Macrine*. Sources Chrétiennes, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971. 320 pp.
- William H. Mc Neill. *Venice: The Hinge of Europe, 1081-1797*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1974. 334 pp. \$10.75.
- John Meyendorff. *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*. Trans. Adele Fiske. New York: St. Vladimir's Press, 1974. 184 pp. Paper.
- John Meyendorff. *Byzantine Theology. Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974. 243 pp. \$20.00.
- Theodore Monachos. *Ἡ Εὐχαριστικὴ Συμμετοχὴ ἐν Ἀγίῳ Ὁρει*. Mount Athos Athens: 1972. 278 pp. Paper.
- David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin (eds.). *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 195. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalum, 1973. 473 pp. Paper.
- Edward Nowak. *Le Chrétien devant la souffrance. Étude sur la pensée de Jean Chrysostom*. Théologie Historique, No. 19. Paris: Beouchesne, 1972. 239 pp. Paper.
- Sidney R. Packard. *12th Century Europe: An Interpretative Essay*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1973. 362 pp. \$12.50.

- Stilianos Papadopoulos. *Padri accrescimento della Chiesa lo Spirito Santo*. Studio patrologico. Trans. T. Moschopoulos. Milan: Istituto di Studi Theologici Ortodossi S. Gregorio Palamas, 1974. 103 pp. Paper.
- A. J. Philippou (ed.). *Orthodox Life and Freedom. Essays in Honor of Archbishop Iakovos*. Oxford: Studion Publications, 1973. 162 pp. \$8.50. Paper.
- Karl Rahner. *Theological Investigations. Volume XII, Confrontations 2. A Crossroad Book*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974. 257 pp. \$9.75.
- Ibrahim Sarrouj. *Le Sacerdoce chez St. J. Chrysostome d'après son traité " Περὶ Ἱερωσύνης "*. Strasbourg: 1972. 233 pp. Paper.
- Gerhard Simon. *Church, State and Opposition in the U.S.S.R.* Trans. Kathleen Matchett. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974. 248 pp. \$12.00.
- The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great*. Trans. and ed. Alexander V. Muller. Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1972. 150 pp. \$10.00.
- Archimandrites Vasileios. *Εἰσοδικόν*. Mount Athos: Monastery of Stavroniketa, 1974. 188 pp. Paper.
- John R. Yungblut. *Rediscovering the Christ. A Crossroad Book*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974. 180 pp. \$7.95.

A NEW JOURNAL

Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies

One of the most stimulating academic developments of the last decades, both in Britain and the United States, has been the growth of post-classical Greek Studies and a wider awareness and appreciation of a vast and important field which stretches from the Mosaics of Ravenna to the poetry of Cavafy. Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies are now taught in several British Universities; the United States has long had its Center for Byzantine Studies in Dumbarton Oaks, but the more recent emergence of the highly successful Modern Greek Studies Association of America has also revealed a considerable interest in the later period. At the same time scholars have increasingly accepted that the Byzantine world did not come to an end in, say, 1204 or 1453 or even later, any more than the Modern Greek world began at one of those dates, and discussion of elements of continuity and discontinuity over the whole period has been lively.

A substantial demand for an English-language journal of high scholarly integrity but capable of satisfying a large readership in the entire post-classical Greek field has been abundantly evident for some years now. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* has been founded to meet this demand, under Anglo-American auspices and the editorship of D. M. Nicol, Koraës Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies in the University of London.

The only editorial criteria of the new annual journal are those of quality. It is expected, however, that roughly equal space will be given to the medieval and modern periods. Individual books will not be reviewed, but there will normally be a survey of recent literature in particular fields.

The subscription to the first volume is \$15.00, send remittance to:
Journals Department, Basil Blackwell, Publisher, 108 Cowley Road,
Oxford OX4 1JF, England.

BASIL BLACKWELL · OXFORD

SUPPLEMENT

PART I

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BOOK REVIEWS

Spyridon Bilalis. *Ἡ Αἵρεσις τοῦ Filioque* [The Heresy of the Filioque]. Vol. I. Athens: Editions of Orthodoxos Typos, 1972. Pp. 565.

The present volume examines the history of the **Filioque**. A considerable part of the study is occupied by the exposition of the teaching of St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas concerning the **Filioque**. It criticizes especially Thomas Aquinas, the chief theorizer of the **Filioque** doctrine, and scholastic theology. It deals, furthermore, with the spurious Patristic texts used by the Latins. Bilalis' conclusion is, of course, that the addition of the **Filioque** to the Creed was imposed upon the Pope by the politics of Frankish and German kings.

The author makes good and extensive use of the arguments of St. Photios, Gregory Palamas and particularly of Markos Eugenikos against the **Filioque** (pp. 283-363). He also re-evaluates the historical contribution and canonical validity of the Council of Florence, considering it a "pseudo-synod" (pp. 314-315), and "hilarotragedy" (pp. 355ff). Fr. Bilalis, however, goes to the extreme occasionally by condemning entirely the Ecumenical Movement and the conciliatory policy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (pp. 157-161, 474, 476ff). In addition, he overemphasizes the point that, as long as the **Filioque** is not repudiated by the Roman Catholic Church an actual union cannot be reached (pp. 21, 161, 456-475).

It is important to make a clear distinction between the canonical and dogmatic meaning and consequences of the **Filioque**. Fr. Bilalis seems to underestimate and completely overlook this distinction. It must be emphasized, on the other hand, that it was and is rather the canonical implications of the **Filioque** (the Primacy of Pope) that prevent the union. Actually, this point was developed by Markos Eugenikos at the Council of Florence (1438-1439), according to its official records, the *Acta Graeca*, and the *Memoirs* of Sylvester Syropoulos (see Ph.D. dissertation of the reviewer: "Markos Eugenikos and the Council of Florence--A Historical Re-evaluation of His Personality", Fordham University, New York, 1973).

The book ends with a long bibliography, quite complete (pp. 503-520), and with three detailed indexes of proper names, and subjects (pp. 521-557).

The author's promise that a second volume is to appear with the title, **The "Filioque" Viewed in the Light of Patristic Theology** (p. 21) is anxiously anticipated by historians as well as theologians.

CONSTANTINE N. TSIRPANLIS
New York City

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.